3/57

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/christianapologe0000revw

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS:

A DEFENSE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

BY

REV. W. DEVIVIER, S.J.

EDITED BY

THE RT. REV. S. G. MESSMER, D.D., D.C.L.,
Bishop of Green Bay, Wis.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS
PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE

Imprimatur.

✝ JOHN M. FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York.

NEW YORK, April 15, 1903.

239
D 496

Copyright, 1903, by BENZIGER BROTHERS.

Printed in the United States of America.

Respectfully Dedicated

TO THE

CATHOLIC READING CIRCLES

OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BY

THE EDITOR.

40958

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

If it be true that a book well recommended by competent critics is sure of a hearty welcome from thoughtful readers, the present volume will find favor with the Catholic public. During the fifteen years of its existence the French original has passed through twelve editions. It has been praised by the Catholic press and has received a flattering recognition on the part of cardinals and prelates. Thus Cardinal Mazzella wrote to the author: "You unite with soundness of doctrine the clearness of exposition which the intelligence of the pupil requires, and you treat your subjects with the reserve necessary to permit the professor to add his own developments. I hope that your work will become a classic text-book to the great advantage of students. People of the world will also read it with profit and pleasure."

Cardinal Deprez, Archbishop of Toulouse, writes: "You have given us in a very clear and concise form an excellent summary of fundamental theology. Not only the pupils for whom your work is more specially intended, but all educated men, desirous to complete their religious studies, will read it with profit. They will learn from its substantial pages to recognize the basis upon which all Christian dogma rests; they will see that if faith is frequently represented as blindfolded, yet she is not wholly blind, and that before giving her full assent to revealed truth, she makes sure that she is not the victim of a pious illusion. I commend you for having added to your dogmatic proofs a few of the objections against religion and the Church by which, unfortunately, many unthinking minds are influenced. Your very clear and always accurate explanations will destroy fatal misunderstandings in men of good faith."

Cardinal Mermillod, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, writes: "It is a compendium, so to speak, in which the proofs of the divinity of the Christian religion and the Catholic Church are compactly grouped and forcibly presented. But if, like the Jews rebuilding Jerusalem, you keep the trowel in one hand, the sword is in the other; you refute victoriously in the name of science the objections against the books of Moses, and in the

name of history the accusations frequently launched against the Catholic Church. In defence of the books of Moses and to show the harmony which exists between the Pentateuch and geology or profane history, you have summed up long works, among others the learned folios of the Abbé Vigouroux. Your manner of stating questions enables you to refute in advance objections not yet stated, but which may arise later. You have facilitated the task of apologist for yourself in your authoritative work by ever bearing in mind St. Augustine's principle: *In necessaris unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.* Your book is characterized by method, lucidity, accurateness, and conciseness; and one recognizes in its pages the work of an eloquent professor."

Cardinal Place, Archbishop of Rennes, writes: "It is a most opportune work to enable young men and men of the world to justify their faith to themselves and to others, and to be convinced that it is not the believer but the sceptic who is condemned by sound reason. The more science, deviating from its proper sphere, seems to encroach upon the domain of religion, the more important it is that faith be equipped with learning. Your excellent work will efficaciously contribute to this end."

Mgr. Fontenau, Archbishop of Albi, writes: "Under a modest title and in a simple and unpretentious form you have united in a single volume all the arguments which Catholic controversy opposes to contemporary irreligion. Exegesis, philosophy, theology, history, physical sciences, political economy, all branches of knowledge, human and divine, concur in your work to demonstrate incontestably the perfect agreement of reason and faith. The proofs are abundant, well chosen, and well presented, the arguments nervous and powerful, the style clear, sober, and precise. . . . Your *Course of Christian Apologetics*, therefore, is not only an instructive book, it is also a finished model of methodical exposition and learned discussion. For these reasons it is truly a most valuable work. Therefore I should like to see it in the library of my seminarians and priests; they will find in it all the elements of Catholic controversy and learn from it how to use them."

Mgr. Vigne, Archbishop of Avignon, writes: "I shall recommend it the more willingly that, in my opinion, it meets the needs of our time, and that, in addition to its being incontestably opportune, it has the essential merit of clearness, solidity of doctrine, and brevity. Ignorance of the truths of religion is the great evil of our day, and undoubtedly one of the chief causes of the weakening of the faith among us. Therefore, Rev. Father, I should like to see your book in the hands of all young people."

Mgr. Sebaux, Bishop of Angoulême, writes: "I am happy to unite my suffrage with that of my venerable colleagues. The book is so clear, so well arranged, and so suited to the condition of minds of the present day that it will render most valuable service. I shall gladly recommend it, and I earnestly desire to see it not only in the hands of the most advanced pupils of our institutions, but also of men of letters, whom a defective religious training has left in ignorance of the decisive reasons of our faith, or who are in a state of doubt created by objections which they know not how to answer."

Mgr. Isoard, Bishop of Annecy, writes: "The author has written for the pupils of the higher classes, and his book will certainly furnish the clearest and most complete text for the lessons of the catechist and the conferences of the preacher. But many others of the faithful will derive notable profit from an assiduous and careful reading of this manual. The students of philosophy and theology in our large seminaries will owe to this study the power of being able later to translate into language corresponding to the needs of the faithful the teaching which they have received in the dry, severe formulas of the language of the Church. I would urge the fathers and mothers of the pupils in our educational houses or in our seminaries to procure first for themselves this book, which they should desire to see in the hands of their children, to acquire a thorough knowledge of it, to study it profoundly: the study of religion is one of their first duties."

The gist of these and numerous other recommendations may be given in the words of Mgr. Rosset, Bishop of Maurienne, who writes: "I consider that the work has all the merits required for a classic. Pupils in our houses of secondary education will study it with fruit; the clergy cannot read it without deriving great advantage; the educated will find in it weapons of defence if they are true Catholics, or reasons for abandoning their errors if they are the victims of prejudice. To guide souls toward the Catholic faith, to confirm in the mind the reasons of our belief, to do good to those who believe and to those who do not believe—such are the results to which P. Devivier's *Course of Christian Apologetics* will largely contribute."

Modern infidelity, armed with the sophisms of rationalism, scepticism, naturalism, and materialism, attempts to undermine the very foundations of Christianity. The battle is no longer confined to the campus of academic and scientific schools; it spreads over the wide field of popular education and literature. The same may be said of those strange aberrations of Spiritism, Christian Science, Theosophy, and a lot of similar religious fads which, like so many mental plagues, begin to attack the masses of the people. "The need of defending the integrity of Chris-

tian faith and morality was never greater than it is to-day, when nearly every doctrine which the Saviour of man, Jesus Christ, entrusted to the Church for the welfare of mankind, is assailed in deadly strife by an unbridled license of mind and heart. Various, indeed, and unlimited is the cunning and artfulness of the enemy in this battle; but first and full of danger is the immoderate mania of writing and of spreading wicked literature among the people. We cannot think of anything more perniciously calculated to effect the ruin of souls by instilling into them a contempt of religion and deluding them with the false charms of sin." (Leo XIII., Const. on forbidden books, Jan. 25, 1897.) Under such conditions it becomes a positive duty of intelligent Catholics to get more fully acquainted with the solid grounds of their faith in the divine character of the Catholic Church, the concrete realization of Christianity, and to apprehend more clearly the worthlessness of infidel and sectarian opposition. In this connection we may call attention to some other weighty words of our Holy Father. In his encyclical "On the Means of Preserving the Faith among the People" (Feb. 15, 1882), Leo XIII. mentions books written in defence of the Catholic religion: "Books must be fought by books; the skill and art from which the greatest harm may come must be turned to work the salvation and welfare of man; the source from whence evil poison is sought must be made to yield the remedy." The Pope then calls upon Catholic writers to make publicly known the claims of the Church upon every Christian, to display the splendid works accomplished by her among all nations, to set forth the blessings she brings upon individuals as well as upon society, and finally to demonstrate the importance of giving the Church that position in society which her divinely-given dignity and the public welfare of the State demand. But the Pope also admonishes the Catholic people to encourage Catholic writers by its hearty co-operation in spreading their books: "For all those who truly and sincerely desire progress in Church and State, whose interests must be defended by the writings of bright minds, it becomes a duty to insure by their liberality the success of these writers."

Observe that in the above words the Pope evidently applies to the defence of the Church the words of Christ: "By their fruits you shall know them." For, as Father Tyrrell, S.J., beautifully explains (Introd. to "The Faith of Millions"), "the mere reasonableness of believing cannot stir the will" to actual belief. Religion must draw the heart unto itself not by its truth alone, but still more by its goodness and beauty. Only when man perceives that faith is able to bring happiness, peace, and delight to his soul will he accept it with

a willing mind. This power of religion for good and its spiritual beauty must be shown principally by its fruits. In this regard what Father Tyrrell says (l. c.) of England applies equally to America. "Nowhere more than in businesslike England, where the distrust of dialectic is so profound and the appeal to palpable results so decisive, have we need to strengthen this argument *ex fructibus*, if we are to draw others or keep those we have. If believers are, as a rule, notably more just, truthful, charitable, beneficent, and temperate than unbelievers; if invisible, supernatural virtue is thus proved to include, presuppose, strengthen, and refine that which is natural and visible, to be a light shining before men, and not merely before God, then the apologist may enter hopefully upon his labors."

Devivier's Manual sets forth both the truth and the goodness of the Catholic religion. Although very compendious in size and treatment, it is sufficiently complete for popular use. It is especially suitable for our Catholic Reading Circles. We are under the impression (if wrongly, so much the better) that in many Reading Circles and other Catholic literary clubs too much time is spent upon secular literature and history; time and labor that would be applied with far greater profit, intellectual, moral, and religious, to the study of the Catholic religion, its dogmas and laws, its liturgy and pious practices, its history and literature. In our opinion a systematic course of short essays in the form of plain exposition or of apologetic discussion upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and the special claims of the Catholic Church, her achievements on every field of civilization (universal charity, individual and social morality, education and science, etc.), will of itself furnish an almost endless programme at once thoroughly instructive and truly delightful. There is no reason why societies of intelligent and loyal Catholic men and women should be afraid to take up in their meetings the study and discussion of the Catholic Faith, provided it is done under proper guidance. This does not mply the continual presence of an official censor in the person of an ecclesiastic. The Catholic English literature of to-day, whether in works of a general character or in special treatises, tracts, and articles, offers many excellent helps to earnest seekers after a fuller knowledge of heavenly truth. Where these Catholic "Guide-books in Religion" are conscientiously and properly followed there will be no danger of going astray on the byways of religious error. Moreover, some clear and intelligent reading, properly selected, of a paragraph or an article from a sound Catholic book or magazine will often afford more instruction and pleasure than a dozen "original essays by club members."

For the purpose of pointing out some of those safe guides to Catholic Reading Circles and others interested in the apologetics

of their faith, we have dropped the author's references to French writers (unless translated into English) and have, in their place, inserted references to Catholic English literature. Catholic periodical literature in particular has received more consideration than usual. It is no exaggeration to say that some Catholic magazines are rich mines of Catholic information; treasures of Catholic truth and sound philosophy, of Catholic virtue and culture, of sacred and profane history, are hidden there; nothing else is needed than "to work the mine." Sets, more or less complete, of such magazines are found in Catholic colleges and convents, the libraries of Catholic clubs, and sometimes in "the study" of the priest and the educated layman. The same may be said of Catholic books in defence of religion. The following list of Catholic apologetic literature to which reference is frequently made in this volume, may appear overcrowded. Our excuse is in the desire of helping all, the high and the lowly, the city and the country reader. What does not suit one may help another, and for the book vainly sought another may be at hand. A few books are mentioned which are no longer in the market. But then "out of print" is not always "out of the shelf"; look for it, by good luck you may find it. Simply as a matter of literary curiosity it may be observed that an English translation in three stout volumes of Rev. Anthony Valsecchi's (O.Pr.; † 1791) "The Foundations of Religion and the Sources of Unbelief" (a work famous in its time and probably the first specimen of a complete Catholic "Apology" in the modern sense) was published in Dublin at the beginning of the last century. Of course it is O.P. The English translation of Bishop Frayssinous' († 1841) celebrated "Defence of Christianity" (a work translated in all European languages) shares a similar fate. American Catholics, we hope, will not allow the beautiful "Conferences of Père Lacordaire" to be forgotten. The uniform edition published by O'Shea, N. Y., some thirty years ago (some conferences were also issued by Protestant publishers) presents a splendid course of Catholic Apologetics, grand in thought as well as expression, and worthy to find a place in every Catholic and public library.

True, many of the arguments given in the earlier apologies for the existence of God and the supernatural order, of revelation, mysteries and miracles, of free-will, conscience and moral law, will not serve effectively to overturn the arguments of modern infidels. As Rev. Dr. Fox (in Cath. World, Jan. 1903, p. 490 ff.) very neatly observes: "Truth does not change; but, as you say, error does. And it is not from the enduring character of truth, but through the Protean character of error, that there arises a variation in the efficacy of certain demonstrations or reasons for belief. . . . If, however, we are to make Catholic truth pre-

vail, we must present it under that aspect through which it will appeal most strongly to those whom we seek to convince. Not merely the objective value of an argument is to be considered, but also the force with which it appeals to a particular mental attitude. . . . In a day when fundamentals are attacked the student who takes utility for his guide will wisely devote himself to those parts of theology—using the term broadly—which bear upon the living issues." The ample attention given by Father Devivier to these "living issues" and to the arguments of modern unbelief is one of the special attractions and advantages of his work.

Persons inquiring after some special point of Catholic doctrine or history often do not have the books at hand which treat in particular of the subject concerned, and they are at a loss where to find an answer to their question. In such a case it will be best to look up some book of a general character corresponding with their subject, where they may hope to find at least a plain, if brief, statement of the Catholic side. Thus, for example, for statements of *Doctrine* they may consult the works of Bishop Hay, Gaume, Card. Gibbons, Bagshawe, Hunter, Schanz, Hettinger, Scheeben, Wilmers; Exposition of Catholic Doctrine (3 vol.); Spirago's Catechism Explained; Mueller's God our Teacher; Power's Catechism. For statements regarding events or facts in *Church History* see the works by Alzog, Brück, Birkhäuser, Parsons, Gilmartin; Butler (Lives of the Saints); Pastor and Mann on the Popes; Balmes, Young, De Haulleville, and Brownlow on Catholic Civilization; Jansen, Gasquet, Cobbett, and Archbp. Spalding on the Reformation. On points of *Controversy* see the Clifton Tracts, the Paulist Tracts, the tracts of the Catholic Truth Societies, especially that of England; Ryder, Milner, De Trevern, Searle, besides the general expositions of the Catholic Creed; Arnold's Catholic Dictionary and Thein's Ecclesiastical Dictionary may also be of good service.

In justice to the translator of this volume, Miss Ella McMahon, it must be stated that several additions inserted from the latest French edition have been translated by the editor. With the exception of some slight changes in the arrangement and of a few additional sentences to render the author's meaning clearer, the original text has been preserved.

May Devivier's Christian Apologetics help to set more fully aglow the Catholic Faith in many minds, and to fan in the hearts of the faithful the fire of holy love for Mother Church!

✠S. G. Messmer.

Easter, 1903.

LIST OF REFERENCES.

The asterisk (*) indicates a Protestant writer.

A. C. Q. The American Catholic Quarterly Review.

A. E. R. American Ecclesiastical Review. (A monthly for the Clergy.)

Aiken. The Dhamma of Gotama, or the Buddha and the Gospel of Christ.

Allies. Formation of Christendom. 3 vol.—Church and State.—The Throne of the Fisherman.—Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood.—The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations.—The Monastic Life.—The See of Peter.—St. Peter, his Name and Office.

Alnatt. Cathedra Petri.—The Church and the Sects.—Church and Bible.—Bible and the Reformation.

Anderdon. Luther.

Audin. Lives of Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII. 3 vol. (Not always reliable.)

Azarias. Essay on the Philosophy of Literature.

Bagshawe. Credentials of the Catholic Church.

Balmes. European Civilization, or Catholicity and Protestantism Compared.—Letters to a Sceptic.

Baluffi. The Charity of the Church Proof of her Divinity.

Barry, Wm. The Papal Monarchy from Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII.

Barton. Angels of the Battlefield.

Bayaert. The Workman.

* *Beal.* Bioplasm.—Life Theories.

Beane. Cardinal Lavigerie.

Begin. The Bible and the Rule of Faith.

Belloc. Historic Nuns.

Best. The Victories of Rome.

Bellord. Relics of the True Cross.

B. N. History of the Jesuits.

* *Bissell.* The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure.

Boedder, S.J. Natural Theology.

Bossuet. The Variations of Protestantism. 2 vol.

Botalla, S.J. Papacy and Schism.—Authority of the Pope.—Infallibility of the Pope. (These two vols. also under the title: The Church and the Pope.)

Bougaud. The Divinity of Christ.
Bowden. The Witness of the Saints.
Brann. The Great Schism of the West.—Truth and Error.—The Popes the Protectors of Popular Liberty.
Bree. Fallacies of Darwinism.
Breen, A. E. Introduction to the Study of the Sacred Scriptures.
Breen, J. D. Sacerdotalism.—Anglican Orders.
Brennan. Science and the Bible.—What Catholics have done for Science.
Bridgett. Ritual of the New Testament.
Broeckardt, S.J. The Fact Divine. (A short Christian Apology.)
* *Brown.* Assyriology, its Use and Abuse.
Brownlow. Slavery and Serfdom in Europe.
Brownson, H. Faith and Science.
Br. W. Works of Orestes Brownson.—Liberalism and the Church.—Brownson's Views (by H. B.).
**Buckingham.* The Bible in the Middle Ages.
Burnet. Path which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church.—Reasons why we should believe in God, etc.
Butler. Lives of the Saints. 12 vol.
Capel. Catholic.
Casey, S.J. The Bible and its Interpreter.
Catholic Church (the) from Within.
C. S. S. L. Catholic Summer School Library. 6 vol.
C. T. S. Catholic Truth Society of England. (Its publications contain a large amount of apologetic literature.)
C. W. The Catholic World. (Monthly magazine.)
Chatard. Christian Truths.—Occasional Essays.
Chateaubriand. Genius of Christianity.
Clarke, S.J. Theosophy.—Divinity of Christ.—Existence of God.—The Pope and the Bible.—Lourdes.—Card. Lavigerie and the Slave-trade.
Cobb, S. H. The Rise of Religious Liberty in America.
Cobbett. History of the Prot. Reformation in England. (Ed. by Dom Gasquet.)
* *Cook.* Religion and Chemistry.—Credentials of Science and Warfare of Faith.
Coppens, S.J. The Living Church.—Moral Principles and Medical Practice.—Moral Philosophy.
Corvo, Fred. Chronicles of the House of Borgia.
Cox, Th. The Pillar and the Ground of Truth.
* *Craig.* Christian Persecutions.
* *Creighton.* History of the Papacy during the Reformation.
Dangers (the) of Spiritualism.
* *Deadly* Error (the) of Christian Science. (Philadelphia.)
De Concilio. Harmony between Science and Religion.
De Trevern. An Amicable Discussion.

Devas. Studies in Family Life.—Political Economy.
Didon, O.Pr. Jesus Christ. 2 vol.—Belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ —Science without God.
Digby. Mores Catholici, or the Ages of Faith. 4 vol.
* *Diman.* The Theistic Argument.
Doellinger. Luther: a biographic sketch.—Heathenism and Judaism.—Judaism and Christianity.—The First Ages of Christianity.—Fables concerning the Popes.—Church and Churches. (Most of these books are O.P.)
Dol. The Dolphin. (A monthly.)
D. R. The Dublin Review.
Drane. Christian Schools and Scholars.
Driscoll. God —The Human Soul. (Both under the title: Christian Philosophy.)
Dupanloup. Papal Sovereignty.
Dwenger. The Spanish Inquisition.
Earnshaw. The Catholic Church and Civil Governments.
* *Einstein, Lewis.* The Italian Renaissance in England.
England, Bishop. His Works. 5 vol.
* *Evans.* Christian Doctrine of Marriage.
Faber. Essay on Beatification and Canonization. (Vol. I. of Oratorian Lives of the Saints.)
Faith (the) of Catholics. 3 vol. (Testimonies of the Primitive Church.)
Fastre. Acts of the Early Martyrs. 5 vol.
Feasey. Monasticism: What is it?
* *Fiske, John.* New France and New England.
Fitz-Arthur. The Worth of Human Testimony.
Fouard. Jesus Christ.—St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity.—St. Paul and his Missionary Labors.
Fox. Religion and Morality.
Frayssinous. Defence of Christianity.
Freppel. Discourse on the Divinity of Christ.
Gagarin. The Russian Clergy.
Galway, S.J. Thoughts on Apostolic Succession.—Is Ritualism Honest? 2 vol.
Ganss. Mariolatry.
Garratt Loretto, the New Nazareth.
Garside. The Sacrifice of the Eucharist and other Doctrines.
Gasquet. Eve of the English Reformation.—The Old English Bible.—Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.
Gaume. Catechism of Perseverance. 4 vol. (A mine of doctrinal and apologetic information.)
* *Gaynor.* The New Materialism.
Gerard, S.J. The Gunpowder Plot.—Science and Scientists.—Science or Romance.—The Antidote.
Gibbons. Faith of our Fathers.—Our Christian Heritage.

Gigot. Biblical Lectures.—A General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures.
Gleason. Trials of the Church.
Gmeiner. Scientific Views and Christian Doctrines.—Spirits of Darkness.—Emmanuel.
Gordon. Seven Lectures, or Some Doctrines of the Church.
* *Graham, R. B. C.* A Lost Arcadia, or the Jesuits in Paraguay.
Green. Indulgences and Tax Tables.
Guibert. In the Beginning
* *Gurnhill.* The Morals of Suicide.
Hammerstein, S.J. Foundations of the Faith.
Haulleville, de. The Future of Catholic Peoples (against Lavelaye's Protestantism and Catholicism.)
Hawarden. Truth and Charity.
Hay, Bishop. His Works. 5 vol.—On Miracles. 2 vol.
Hedley. Who is Jesus Christ?—The Spirit of Faith.—Christian Inheritance.
Hecker. Aspirations of Nature.
Henry, L. E.—The Cloister, or the Apostolic Monks and Nuns who Live there.
Hergenroether. The Catholic Church and the Christian State. 2 vol.—Anti-Janus.
Hettinger. Natural Religion.—Revealed Religion.—Supremacy of the Apostolic See.
Hewit. The King's Highway.—Problems of the Age.
Hope. Conversion of the Teutonic Race.—The First Divorce of Henry VIII.
Hughes, Archbp. Works. 2 vol.—Debate with Breckenridge.—Brooksiana.
Hughes, S.J. Principles of Anthropology and Biology.
Humphrey, S.J. The Sacred Scriptures. (Formerly under the title: The Written Word.)—The Bible and Belief.—The Vicar of Christ.—Urbs et Orbis.—Christian Marriage.
Hunter. Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. 3 vol.
I. E. R. Irish Ecclesiastical Record. (A monthly for the clergy.)
Ives. Two Lectures on the Inquisition.
Jansen. History of the German people. 6 vol.
Johnson, L. Religious Liberty in Maryland and Rhode Island.
Joly. Psychology of the Saints.
Jouin, S.J. Evidences of Christianity.
Kenrick, P. The Primacy of the Apostolic See vindicated.—Vindication of Catholics.
Knox. When does the Church Speak Infallibly?
Lacordaire Conferences. 6 vol.—The Order of St. Dominic.
Laforet. Why Men do Not Believe.
Lambert. Answers to Ingersoll.—Tactics of Infidels.

Lenormant. The Beginnings of History.
Leo. XIII.—The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII. Translations collected from Approved Sources.
Lilly, W. S. Ancient Religion and Modern Thought.—Chapters in European History.—A Century of Revolution.—Shibboleths.—Claims of Christianity.—Essays and Speeches.
Lindsay, Collins. De Ecclesia et Cathedra, or The Empire Church of Christ.—Evidences for the Papacy.
Livius. St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.
Lucas, Dr. G. J. Agnosticism and Religion.
Lucas, S.J. Fra Girolamo Savonarola.
Lyons. Christianity and Infallibility: Both or Neither.
Madden. The Reaction from Agnostic Science.
Maglione. The Vatican and the Kingdom of Italy.
Maher, S.J. Psychology.
Maguire. Pontificate of Pius IX. (Formerly "Rome, its Ruler and Institutions.")
Maistre, de. Of the Pope.—Letters of a Gentleman on the Inquisition.
* *Maitland.* The Dark Ages.
Malachy. Has the Reformation Reformed Anything?
* *Mallock.* Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption.
Manahan. Triumph of Religion.
Mann. Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages. 2 vol.
Manning, Card. Miscellanies. 2 vol.—The Vatican Decrees.—Story of the Vatican Council.—Independence of the Holy See.—Why I became a Catholic (formerly under the title: Religio Viatoris).—Characteristics from M.'s writings (by Lilly).—Essays on Religion and Literature. 3 vol. (By different writers, edited by Mgr. M.)
Marcy. Christianity and its Conflicts.
Martinet. Religion in Society. 2 vol.—Philosophy of the Catechism. (Excellent, but O.P.)
Maurel, S.J. The Church and the Sovereign Pontiff.
McErlane. The Church of Christ the Same Forever.
McLaughlin. Indifferentism.—The Divine Plan of the Church.
Melia. Origin, Persecution, etc., of the Waldenses.
Mercier. Relation of Experimental Psychology to Philosophy.
Merry del Val. The Truth of Papal Claims.
M. S. H Messenger of the Sacred Heart. (Monthly magazine, now: The Messenger.)
Michaud. History of the Crusades. 3 vol.
Miley. History of the Papal States. 3 vol.
Milner, Bishop. The End of Controversy. (Ed. by L. Rivington.)
Ming, S.J. The Holy See.—Data of Modern Ethics.

Mivart. Genesis of Species.—Evolution —Lessons from Nature. —Man and Ape.—Origin of Human Reason.—Nature and Thought.
Molitor. Burning Questions (on Church and State).
Molloy. Geology and Revelation.
Monsabré. Marriage, Conferences on.
Montagu. Some Popular Errors in Politics, etc.
Montalembert. The Monks of the West. 6 vol.
Montault, de. Lives of the Roman Pontiffs. 2 vol.
M. The Month. (Monthly magazine.)
Moran, Card. Occasional Papers.
Moriarty. Stumbling Blocks made Stepping Stones.—The Keys of the Kingdom.—The Catholic Church in its Relation to Human Progress.
Mulhane, C. W. Leprosy and the Charity of the Church.
Mullen. The Canon of the Old Testament.
Murphy, J N.—The Chair of Peter.
Newman, Card. Difficulties felt by Anglicans.—Historical Sketches, 3 vols. Development of Christian Doctrine.—The Idea of a University.
Nicolas. Divinity of Christ.
Northcote. Roma Sotteranea, or The Roman Catacombs.
Northgraves. Mistakes of Modern Infidels.
O'Brien, Archbp. The Philosophy of the Bible.
* *Occultism,* The Danger of Spiritual. (Philadelphia.)
O'Connor, S.J. Luther's Own Statements.
* *O'Neil, Warren.* Refutation of Darwinism.
O'Neil, O. Pr. Savonarola.
O'Reilly, S.J. Relations between Church and Society.
Ozanam. Civilization in the Fifth Century.
Pallen. What is Liberalism?
Palmer. A Visit to the Russian Church.
Parsons. Lies and Errors of History.—Studies in Church History. 6 vol.
Pascal. On the Divinity of Christ. (Edited by Rev. Morris.)
Pastor. History of the Popes of the Renaissance. 6 vol.
Picard. Christianity and Agnosticism.
Points of History. (Boston.)
Poland, S.J. The Kingdom of Italy and the Sovereignty of Rome.—The Truth of Thought.
Pollen, John H., S.J. Acts of the English Martyrs.
Preston. The Vicar of Christ.—Christian Unity —God and Reason.—Reason and Revelation.—Protestantism and the Bible.—Protestantism and the Church.
Quatrefages. The Human Species.
* *Rashdall.* The Universities in the Middle Ages. 2 vol.
Reusch. Nature and the Bible. 2 vol.
Rhodes. Visible Unity of the Church.

Ricards. Catholic Christianity and Modern Unbelief.—Aletheia. (On the Catholic Rule of Faith.)
Rickaby, John, S.J. First Principles of Knowledge.
Rickaby, Jos., S.J. Moral Philosophy.—Oxford and Cambridge Conferences.—Positivism.—Political and Moral Essays.
Rio. Poetry of Christian Art.
Rivington. Authority.—Dependence.—The Roman Primacy from A.D. 430 to 451.—The Primitive Church.
* *Rogers, Dr. W. R.* History of Babylonia and Assyria. 2 vol.
Ronayne, S. J. God Knowable and Known.—Religion and Science.
Ryan, Bishop. Apostolical Succession.
Ryder. Catholic Controversy.
Schadler. Beauties of the Catholic Church. (Her Liturgy.)
Schanz. A Christian Apology. 3 vol.
Scheeben. Manual of Catholic Theology. 2 vol.—Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century.
Schroeder. American Catholics and the Roman Question.
Searle. Plain Facts for Fair Minds.
Shanahan. The Idea of God.
Shea. History of the Catholic Church in the United States. 4 vol.—History of the Catholic Missions.
Sheahan. Batta, or Vain Repetitions. (Defence of Catholic Prayers.)
Shield. The Bible against Protestantism.
Smyth. Genesis and Science.
* *Smith.* Acadia: a Lost Chapter in American History.
Soderini. Socialism and Catholicism.
Souben. Beauty of the Christian Dogma.
Spalding, J. L., Bishop. Lectures and Discourses.—Essays and Reviews.—Religion, Agnosticism, and Education.
Spalding, J. M., Archbp. Miscellanies.—Evidences of Catholicity. —History of the Protestant Reformation.
* *St. Clair.* Darwinism and Design.
Stang. Luther.—On the Eve of the Reformation.—More about the Huguenots.
Starr, E. A. Christian Art.
Stone, Kent. The Invitation Heeded.
Stevenson, S.J. The Truth about Wycliff.
Sweeney. Pope and Emperor.—Lectures on the Council.
* *Taylor.* The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages.
Thébaud, S.J. Gentilism.—The Church and the Gentile World. 2 vol.—The Church and the Moral World.
Thompson.—Sufferings of the Church in England.
Thein. Christian Anthropology.—Difficulties of the Bible.—The Bible and Rationalism. 4 vol.
Thorold. Catholic Mysticism.

Tondini. The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Orthodox Church.
* *Tout.* The Empire and the Papacy, A.D. 918–1273.
* *Townsend.* Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages.
Treacy. Tributes of Protestant Writers to the Truth and Beauty of the Catholic Church.
Tyrrell, S.J. External Religion.—The Faith of the Millions. 2 vol.
U.B. University Bulletin. (Quarterly review of the Catholic University.)
Ullathorne. The Endowments of Man.
Van der Doncht. Mrs. Eddy and Bob Ingersoll.
Van der Hagen. Where is the Church of Christ?
Vaughan, Archbp. of Sidney. Science and Religion.—Reasonableness of Christianity.
Vaughan, J., Mgr. National Decay and Romanism.—Life after Death (Immortality).
Verres.—Luther: a Historical Portrait.
Veuillot. Life of Christ. (Against Renan.)
Villemain.—Life of Gregory VII.
Walworth. The Gentle Skeptic. (On the Bible.)
Waterworth. The Fathers on St. Peter.
Ward, W. Geo. Philosophy of Theism. 2 vol.—Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority.—Devotional and Scriptural Essays.
Ward, Wilfrid. The Wish to Believe.—Clothes of Religion. (Both together with other essays in "Witnesses to the Unseen.")
Wegg-Prosser. Galileo and his Judges.
Wilberforce, O.Pr. Dominican Missions and Martyrs in Japan.
Wilberforce, Rob. I. Church Authority.
Willington. Dark Pages of English History. (Prot. Intol.)
Wiseman, Card. His Works. 9 vol.
* *Woolsey.* Divorce and Divorce Legislation in the United States.
Young. Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared.
Zahm. Catholic Science and Scientists.—Bible, Science, and Faith.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

EDITOR'S PREFACE 3
LIST OF REFERENCES 11

PART FIRST.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Chap. I. GENERAL EXPLANATIONS 25
Art. I. General Notions 25
I. Religion 25
II. Revelation 29
III. Object and Division of this Course 33
IV. The Three Historical Phases of Revealed Religion 34
First Phase: Primitive or Patriarchal Religion 34
Second Phase: Mosaic Religion 35
Third Phase: The Christian Religion 36
Art. II. Examination of Three Preliminary Questions 38
I. The Rôle of Reason in Matters of Faith 38
II. The Mysteries of Religion 42
III. The Criterion of Certainty in Matters of Faith 46
Chap. II. HISTORIC VALUE OF THE BIBLE 52
Art. I. Authority of the Pentateuch 56
I. Authenticity of the Pentateuch 57
Thesis: The Pentateuch is the Work of Moses, the Lawgiver of the Hebrews 57
II. Integrity of the Pentateuch 60
III. Veracity of the Pentateuch 61
Art. II. The Pentateuch and the Sciences 63
I. The Bible and Geology 72
Thesis: Geology Does Not Contradict the Biblical Account of the Origin and Formation of the Universe of the Earth 72
II. The Bible and Astronomy 86
III. The Bible and Biology 93
IV. The Bible and Paleontology 97
1. Order of Creation of Organisms 97
2. The Origin of Man. Transformism 99

PAGE
3. The Difference between Man and Animals... 102
Thesis: Man Differs Essentially from Animals.. 104
4. The Unity of the Human Species and its Descent from Adam..... 110
5. Antiquity of the Human Race..... 117
V. The Bible and Modern Discoveries in Egypt and Assyria..... 130
Art. III. Authority of the Gospels..... 141
I. Authenticity..... 141
Thesis: The Gospels were Written, in the First Century of the Christian Era, by the Authors whose Names they Bear; that is, by the Apostles or their Immediate Disciples..... 142
II. Integrity of the Gospels..... 146
III. Truthfulness of the Gospels..... 148
IV. Answers to Objections..... 152
Chap. III. Demonstration of the Divinity of the Christian Religion..... 161
Art. I. Remarks on the Method to Follow in this Demonstration..... 161
Art. II. Miracle and Prophecy..... 163
I. Miracle..... 163
Thesis: Miracles are Possible..... 166
Thesis: There are Miracles of the Existence of which we may (I) have Certain Knowledge, (II) the Miraculous Nature of which we may Discern Scientifically or Philosophically..... 172
II. Prophecy..... 182
Art. III. Ten Proofs of the Divinity of the Mission of Jesus Christ, and of His Work, the Christian Religion.. 183
I. First Proof.
The Miracles Performed by Our Lord..... 183
II. Second Proof.
The Resurrection of Jesus Christ..... 187
III. Third Proof.
The Fulfilment of the Prophecies Concerning the Person and Mission of Jesus Christ..... 200
IV. Fourth Proof.
The Miracles of the Apostles and of the Disciples of Jesus..... 208
V. Fifth Proof.
Fulfilment of the Prophecies Made by Jesus Himself..... 212
VI. Sixth Proof.
The Miraculous Establishment of the Religion of Jesus, and its Perpetual Duration Through all Ages..... 217
VII. Seventh Proof.
The Testimony of the Martyrs..... 229
VIII. Eighth Proof.
The Marvellous Fruits of Christianity, or the

PAGE
Wonderful Revolution which it Effected in the World. . . . 236
IX. Ninth Proof.
The Doctrinal Teaching of Christ. . . . 243
The Dogmatic Teaching of Christ. . . . 244
The Moral Teaching of Christ. . . . 252
The Teaching of Christ Concerning Worship. . . . 255
X. Tenth Proof.
The Incomparable Holiness of Christ. . . . 278
Chap. IV. The Divinity of Jesus Christ. . . . 285
Summary of the Ten Proofs. Conclusion of the First Part. . . . 292

PART SECOND.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Chap. I. General Notions. . . . 299
I. Our Object. . . . 299
II. The Church. . . . 301
Thesis: Jesus Christ Truly and Personally Founded His Religion under the Form of a Real Society, of a Church. . . . 303
Chap. II. The Church of Rome is the True Church of Jesus Christ. . . . 310
Art. I. Notes of the True Church of Jesus Christ. . . . 311
I. Of the Notes in General. . . . 311
II. Division of the Notes. . . . 313
III. Positive Notes. . . . 313
A. Unity. . . . 313
I. Unity of Doctrine and Belief. . . . 314
Thesis: Jesus Christ Willed that His Church should be One in Doctrine and Belief; that is, He made it an Obligation for Pastors to Teach, and consequently for the Faithful to Believe, Unreservedly, all the Truths Revealed by Him 314
II. Unity of Ministry or Government. . . . 317
Thesis: Jesus Christ has Established in the Church an Authority which He confided to the Apostles and to which all the Faithful must Submit; consequently Whosoever Separates Himself from their Ministry is Guilty of Schism and thereby Excluded from the Church 318
B. Sanctity. . . . 321
I. The Sanctity of the Church in General. . . . 321
Thesis: The Church of Christ is not Composed Exclusively of Men Just in the Sight of God. . 323
II. The Sanctity of the Church Considered as a Note. . . . 323

PAGE
C. Catholicity 324
Thesis: Catholicity is an Indispensable Attribute of the True Church 325
D. Apostolicity 327
Thesis: Jesus Christ willed that the Powers Given to His Apostles should be Transmitted to all their Successors 327
Art. II. The Church of Rome Possesses the Four Positive Notes of the True Church 331
I. The Church of Rome Possesses Unity 331
II. The Church of Rome Possesses Sanctity 335
III. The Church of Rome Possesses Catholicity 338
IV. The Church of Rome Possesses Apostolicity 339
Conclusion of Article II 342
Art. III. Protestantism Does Not Possess the Notes of the True Church of Christ 343
I. Protestantism is Absolutely Devoid of Unity 345
II. Protestantism Does Not Possess Holiness 348
III. Protestantism Does Not Possess Catholicity 352
IV. Protestantism Does Not Possess Apostolicity 352
V. The Protestant Rule of Faith Differs from that of Christ 355
Thesis: The Protestant Rule of Faith is Untenable.. 355
Art. IV. The Schismatic Greek Church Does No Possess the Marks of the True Church 360
I. The Greek Church has Neither Unity of Belief nor of Ministry 366
II. The Greek Church Does Not Possess Sanctity 368
III. The Greek Church Does Not Possess Catholicity... 369
IV. The Greek Church Does Not Possess Apostolicity.. 370
Conclusion 371
Art. V. The Primacy of the See of Peter, or the Papacy... 373
First Thesis: Christ Conferred upon St. Peter the Primacy of Jurisdiction over the Whole Church.. 373
Second Thesis: Jesus Christ Desired that this Primacy should Descend to the Lawful Successors of Peter 381
Third Thesis: The Church of Rome Possesses the Primacy of the See of Peter 383
Chap. III. Certain Prerogatives Conferred by Jesus Christ upon His Church 391
Art. I. Indefectibility of the Church 391
Thesis: Jesus Christ Wished His Church to Endure without any Essential Change until the End of Time 392
Art. II. Authority or Powers of the Church 393
I. The Power to Teach 394
II. The Power to Confer the Sacraments 397
III. Power to Govern 397
Art. III. Infallibility of the Church 399
I. Its Nature and Necessity 399

PAGE

First Thesis: The Authority Divinely Established to Teach Men the Doctrine of Jesus Christ must be Infallible in its Teaching. 400
Second Thesis: Jesus Christ Established in His Church an Authority Infallible in its Dogmatic and Moral Teaching 401
II. Object of Infallibility 403
III. Subject of Infallibility 404
Thesis: When He speaks as Head of the Church, with Plenary Doctrinal Authority, the Sovereign Pontiff is Invested with Infallibility. 405
IV. Conditions of Infallibility 409
Art. IV. Relations between Church and State 410
First Thesis: The Ecclesiastical Power and the Civil Power, Church and State, are Independent or Sovereign, each Within the Limits of its Proper Sphere of Action 411
I. Independence of the Spiritual Power 411
II. Independence of the Civil Power 415
III. Rights of the Church 416
Second Thesis: In Cases of Conflict, that is, when in Mixed Matters the Two Authorities Prescribe Contradictory Obligations for Members Owing Allegiance to Both Powers, the Authority of the Church must Prevail over that of Civil Society . . 417
Third Thesis: The Church and the State should Mutually Help Each Other 419
IV. The Church should Aid and Protect the State. . . . 420
V. The Temporal Power Owes Assistance to the Church 420
Art. V. On Liberalism and Liberty 424
I. Notions Concerning Liberalism 424
II. Modern Liberties 435
III. Tolerance 442
IV. Notions Concerning Liberty 449
Chap. IV. Certain Accusations against the Church 457
Art. I. Intolerance of the Church 458
I. In What Sense the Catholic Church is Intolerant . . 458
II. Protestant Intolerance 460
III. Intolerance of Other Enemies of the Church 464
IV. On the Maxim: Outside the Church There is No Salvation 466
Art. II. The Inquisition 473
I. Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle 476
II. The Proceedings of the Inquisition 480
Art. III. The Trial of Galileo 488
I. The Decree of 1616 and the Infallibility of the Church 489
II. Was Galileo a Martyr to Science? 493
Art. IV. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes 496

PAGE
Art. V. Crusades and So-called Religious Wars..... 503
Art. VI. The Papal Power over Temporal Rulers in the Middle Ages..... 507
I. The Power Exercised by the Popes in the Middle Ages over Temporal Princes was Perfectly Lawful..... 508
II. The Popes Exercised their Rights in a Manner Very Salutary to Society..... 512
Art. VII. The Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes..... 514
Art. VIII. Bad Popes..... 517
Chap. V. The Church and Civilization..... 521
Art. I. The State of the World before Christ, or Pagan Civilization..... 523
I. A General Glance..... 523
II. The Lot of Individuals..... 526
I. Slaves..... 526
II. Gladiators..... 528
III. The Poor and the Unfortunate..... 530
IV. Workmen..... 531
III. The Family..... 531
IV. Public Society and the Relations between Nations. 533
Art. II. The State of the World after Christ, or Christian Civilization..... 535
I. A General Glance..... 535
II. The Lot of Individuals..... 536
I. Slaves and Gladiators..... 536
II. The Poor and the Unfortunate..... 539
III. The Working Classes..... 540
III. Family Life..... 541
IV. Public Society and the Relations between Nations. 542
V. Transformation of Barbarous Nations..... 543
VI. Catholic and Protestant Nations..... 546
Art. III. The Church and Intellectual Culture..... 550
I. The Influence of the Church on Letters and Science..... 550
II. The Church and the Fine Arts..... 557
III. The Church and Education..... 558
I. Popular Education..... 558
II. University and College Education..... 567
General Conclusion..... 571

Alphabetical Index..... 575

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

PART FIRST.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL EXPLANATIONS.

ART. I.—GENERAL NOTIONS.

I. Religion.

Religion.—According to the etymological meaning of the word, religion may be defined as the sum of the ties or relations which bind man to God.[1] Between God and man there exist two kinds of relations: one results immediately and of necessity from the very nature of man; the other has been added by the free and sovereign will of God. The first kind, with the duties which flow therefrom, constitutes *natural religion;* the second forms *supernatural religion.* It is important to have a clear and accurate idea of this distinction.

[1] On the *Existence of God* see Chatard (Ch. Tr.), Clarke, Driscoll, Gibbons (Ch. H.), Lambert, Manning (R. V., a. 1), Northgraves, Archbp. O'Brien, Rickaby, Ricards, Ronayne, Br. W. ii. (Refut. of Atheism), A. C. Q. vi., vii., xi., and in general works against Atheism, Agnosticism, and Positivism, especially Picard, Lucas, Madden, I.E.R., Oct., Nov. 1901; also references on next page. On *Religion* see Schanz, I., ch. 3, 4.

NATURAL RELIGION.[1]—Man, created by God out of nothing, holds from his Creator all that he is and all that he has: his body with all its senses; his soul with all its faculties. He is indebted to God every moment for the preservation and development of this body and this soul, and the divine concurrence is necessary for every one of his acts. From God come also all the creatures with whom we are in perpetual relation by reasons of necessity, pleasure, or profit.

If this be our position, and it undoubtedly is, if man holds everything so absolutely from God that without Him he would have nothing, would not even exist and act, it is undeniably evident that man belongs to God; that he is His property and possession; that he must live in absolute dependence upon his Creator and Benefactor; that he can think, that he can say, that he can do only what God wills; that he must conduct himself everywhere and always as a subject toward his sovereign master. These relations and these duties are as immutable as they are necessary, for the nature of man does not change, and God cannot cease to be his Creator and sovereign Master.

These relations, or, if you will, this absolute dependence on God, and these duties constitute *natural religion*. It may be defined as the sum of the relations which exist, in virtue of the creation itself, between God and man, together with the duties which these relations impose on man.

We shall not insist any further on these natural relations between God and man. This belongs to the province of philosophic inquiry. No rational being can doubt the existence and obligation of natural religion without denying God and the creation of man, and without destroying the moral order upon which human society is based.[2]

SUPERNATURAL OR POSITIVE RELIGION.—Besides these

[1] Hettinger, N. R.; Boedder, S.J., N. Th.; Preston, G. and R.

[2] Fox, Rel. and Mor.; A. C. Q. xxv. 41; I. E. R., Apr. 1902; also Catholic writers on Ethics or Moral Philosophy, f. i. Rickaby, Conway, Ming, etc.

first ties, God, in His supreme authority and infinite goodness, could have established between Him and His creature higher relations and more intimate communication.

Nothing, in truth, obliged God to do more for man than the needs of the nature He had given him required, nor could anything prevent Him from lavishing new benefits upon him. He was free to raise man, who was only His subject, to the dignity of His son by adoption; to communicate to him, by means of sanctifying grace, a principle of life higher than that which he held from his nature, preparing for him at the end of his life the incomparable happiness of contemplating in heaven his Creator and Father face to face. Such an act of ineffable goodness, performed in virtue of the plenitude of His dominion over man, in no way destroys the first work of God; in fact, the relations and the duties which constitute natural religion continue to exist, and these new relations only elevate, perfect, and embellish the nature of man. Thus the graft does not destroy the nature of the tree; it only changes and improves it.

New duties for man necessarily spring from these new relations. Let us beware, however, of regarding them as an onerous burden. These obligations, which are, moreover, light, are most abundantly compensated by the multiplied advantages which result from our elevation to the supernatural order. God, at the same time that He assigned us an end, a destiny incomparably more sublime than the end we should have had in the purely natural order, promised us a happiness incomparably greater, and He has given us, in supernatural grace, most powerful and abundant means of attaining this end and of meriting this happiness. Let us observe, in passing, that this grace gives us much greater facility for observing the decalogue, that is, for accomplishing the duties which flow from our nature itself.

This *supernatural* religion is also called *positive*, because it is imposed upon man by a positive and formal act of the free will of God.

Supernatural religion may be defined as the sum of the new relations which elevate man to the dignity of a child of God, and assign him as final end the beatific vision, the sight of God face to face in heaven, as well as the duties which result from these supereminent relations.

Remarks.—1st. By the *last end* of man we mean the supreme term of his existence, the end he is obliged to attain and the possession of which will cause him to obtain his perfection and eternal happiness.

2d. God only is the last end of every intelligent creature. But God may be known directly, i.e. in Himself, or indirectly, i.e. by means of His works. If man had been created only for a natural end, his fidelity in accomplishing, during the time of his probation, the precepts of the natural law would have merited for him, at the end of his probation, a *natural* happiness. Then, contemplating in creatures the traces of the divine perfections, he would have had a very perfect knowledge of God. He would have loved Him with a love proportionate to this knowledge, and in this knowledge and this love he would have found the complete satisfaction of his desires. Very superior, however, is the supernatural end or happiness for which he is destined. It consists in seeing God as He is in Himself, consequently in loving Him, and in possessing Him in an immediate and ineffable manner. To this end the intelligence must necessarily be raised above its own strength by an aid essentially supernatural, which theologians call the *light of glory*. This aid or this grace communicates to the soul a sort of *participation of the divine nature*, as St. Peter says (2 Pet. i. 4), and renders it capable of enjoying the same good which constitutes the infinite happiness of God.

3d. It would be an error to think that Adam was raised to the supernatural order only after he had lived a longer or shorter period under the rule alone of natural law or religion: the privilege of child of God was granted and imposed upon Adam, for himself and his posterity, simultaneously with

that of existence. Hence man never had a purely natural end.

II. Revelation.[1]

Nature of Revelation.—Natural religion being a necessary consequence of the relations existing between God and man in virtue of their very nature, it follows that in order to prove the necessity[2] and existence of this religion it suffices to have a proper knowledge of the two beings between whom these relations exist. Thus man may, without other assistance, discover the truths and precepts of natural religion. He finds them engraven, so to speak, by the hand of God, in the depth of his mind and heart.

With supernatural religion it is very different: as there is question here of relations which arise solely from the free will of God, natural reason is powerless to discover them. The truths and precepts of the supernatural order can be known to us only by a manifestation on the part of God, by a *revelation*. Revelation, therefore, is the means by which God makes supernatural religion known to man. For this reason the terms supernatural religion and revealed religion are usually confounded.

Revelation may be defined as a supernatural act by which God makes known certain truths to man. We say in a general way *certain truths*, because God may, if He pleases, reveal not only supernatural truths, but also truths which are not in themselves above reason. In fact, a good number of truths of this kind have been revealed to us. For example, the precepts of the decalogue, with the exception of those relating to the observance of the Sabbath, belong to the natural law; God, however, has not deemed it useless to strengthen our conscience by a solemn revelation of these precepts. He has thus added to the light of reason the

[1] Schanz, II.; Hunter, I.; Hettinger, R. R.; Manning, l.c.

[2] On *Indifferentism* see McLaughlin; Bp. Spalding, l. 1; C. T. S. 37; Hettinger, N.R., ch. 1.

authority of His infallible word in order to make the knowledge of these fundamental truths which are necessary to all men *easier*, *more certain*, *purer*, and *more universal*.

Possibility of Revelation.—In order to ruin the very foundation of all supernatural religion, the enemies of Christianity have accumulated a number of sophisms tending to establish the impossibility of all revelation. We need not stop to refute them at any length. We shall do better. We shall prove most positively that revelation really exists, and it must follow of itself that it is *possible*. A simple observation suggested by common sense is sufficient, moreover, to overthrow the whole scaffolding of rationalism. Man, an intelligence finite and limited in so many respects, has received from God the power to communicate his thoughts to a fellow being, yet God could be powerless to enter into communication with man! A scholar may impart to the ignorant the secrets which his genius has penetrated, yet God could lack means to communicate to us truths which concern our highest interests, our elevation to the supernatural order!

Such revelation is the more possible in that it responds to the divine goodness and is of incontestable advantage to man: by enlightening the mind, it communicates greater energy to the will and thus aids man to attain his end. It is evident, moreover, that revelation, so far from crushing and annihilating our reason, tends to perfect it, by causing it to know sublime and important truths that it never, of itself, could have discovered. Does the telescope destroy the sight because it gives it greater range, and causes it to see stars hitherto hidden in the depth of the firmament? Are the physical powers of man destroyed because the lever, steam, and electricity help him to do a tenfold work?

Necessity of Revelation.[1]—If revelation is possible, if it is of incontestable advantage, and if, as we shall show, it really exists, we may dispense with proving its necessity.

[1] Br. W. v. 280 ff., 302 ff.; Hecker, Aspirations; Humphrey Written W., ch. 13; Archbp. O'Brien, p. iii., ch. 5.

Something, however, should be said upon this question, particularly at a time when we hear so much of the independence and sovereignty of reason, and when so many absolutely deny supernatural revelation, regarding it as useless and superfluous.

Let us distinguish, first of all, between *moral* necessity and physical or *absolute* necessity. The latter supposes a complete impossibility to attain, without revelation, religious truth; the former, great but not insurmountable difficulty.

It is evident that a revelation is *absolutely* necessary to make known to us the existence and the duties of the supernatural order. Here, in fact, all depends, as we have seen, on the free will of God. The same necessity exists for attaining a knowledge of the mysteries which it pleases God to teach us: we shall make this sufficiently evident later.

But it is not the same with the theoretical and practical truths which form the basis of *natural* religion; reason is capable, even in its present state of decadence, of acquiring of itself a knowledge of these. Thus reason may by its own light reach a knowledge of the existence and unity of God, of His providential action upon man and the world, of the immortality of the soul, the obligation of a moral law with a sanction in the future life—in a word, a knowledge of the foundations of the moral life. Nevertheless, if mankind had been abandoned to itself, if God had not come to its aid by the light of a positive revelation, an *immense majority of men*, owing to want of time, facility, or courage, would not have attained a clear and certain knowledge of these essential truths, or would have attained them late in life and in an imperfect degree. And yet religion is indispensable not only to certain privileged minds but to all men and at all periods of life. It would have been still more impossible to acquire a knowledge of truths in detail, and of all the natural duties of man toward God, toward his neighbor, and toward himself. To be convinced of the weakness and inadequacy of reason left to itself, we need only recall the

monstrous errors which, with the exception of the Jewish people, abounded among the nations of the world before the coming of Christ. What absurdities were taught in the schools of philosophy itself on the most important and vital questions, questions, moreover, which appear so simple to minds enlightened by Christian faith! What monstrous errors in Plato's famous treatise on "The Republic"! One of his most enthusiastic admirers, Mr. Aimé Martin, rightly charges him with cruelty as well as the most flagrant immorality. The greatest philosophers of antiquity earnestly desired to be enlightened upon these capital questions, but they acknowledged that the light must come to them from heaven. "The truths necessary to man," says Plato, "are easily learned if we are taught them, but no one can learn them unless God shows him the way." "We must wait," he says elsewhere, "until some one comes to teach us how we must bear ourselves toward God and toward men." They recognized in a still higher degree their inability to raise the masses from their moral and intellectual degradation, and, what is more, it gave them but little concern. How, indeed, could they have succeeded in such an attempt, being themselves unable to agree on the most important truths and their lives being too often in open conflict with their teaching?

Modern philosophers who, after so many centuries of Christianity, endeavor to answer by their own light the great problems which unceasingly perplex souls, fall only too frequently into the most extravagant errors of antiquity; in the words of St. Paul, "They became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened: for professing themselves to be wise they became fools." (Rom. i. 21, 22.) The history of contemporaneous philosophy proves with irresistible eloquence that there is not a single truth of the natural order which found acceptance among them.

Therefore, it is a *moral necessity for mankind*, in its present condition, to learn by divine revelation—a means as safe as it is easy—even the truths which, strictly speaking, may be

discovered by the unaided reason, and the knowledge of which is indispensable for the guidance of human life. See also Part I., Ch. III., A. 3, Sect. 8, and Part II., Ch. V.

To convince ourselves that this is the doctrine of the Church on the necessity of revelation, let us read what the Vatican Council (Const. I. ch. 2.) teaches on the subject: "Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the principle and end of all things, may be known with certainty through the natural light of reason, by means of created things; for the invisible perfections of God have become visible since the creation of the world, by the knowledge which His works give us of Him. Nevertheless, it has pleased the wisdom and goodness of God to reveal Himself to us and to reveal the decrees of His will by another way which is supernatural." This is what the Apostle says: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets: last of all, in these days hath spoken to us by His Son." (Heb. i. 1, 2.) To this divine revelation all men, even in the present state of the human race, owe the power of knowing *promptly, unerringly,* and *with absolute certainty* those divine things which are not accessible to human reason. Nevertheless, it is not for this reason that revelation is *absolutely necessary,* but because God, in His infinite goodness, has destined man for a *supernatural* end, that is, to participate in divine blessings which completely surpass human intelligence; for "eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him." (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

III. Object and Division of this Course.

We have given a brief summary of the teaching of the Catholic Church on the subject of religion and revelation. But is this teaching founded on truth, is it supported by irrefutable and absolute facts? Has that which God in His wisdom and mercy could do in favor of humanity been

really done? In a word, is there a *supernatural* religion revealed and imposed upon man under pain of failing to attain his last end? What is this religion, and where is it taught in all its purity and integrity?

The answer to these questions will form the subject of this Course of Apologetics. In the first part we shall prove that God has really revealed Himself to man, and that the Christian religion is, since the coming of Christ, the supernatural religion and obligatory for all men. In the second part we shall prove that only the Catholic Church preserves this Christian religion in its integrity, and that she alone is charged to teach it to the world.

IV. The Three Historical Phases of Revealed Religion.

In order to establish that the Christian religion is revealed by God and imposed upon man, we shall start with a fact absolutely undeniable, attested as it is by all historic records. This fact is that there has always existed on earth a religion calling itself supernatural and revealed by God. We see it in the very cradle of the human race and throughout the centuries in its various phases of development. These phases bear respectively the name of primitive or patriarchal religion, Mosaic religion, Christian religion.

Let us begin by giving an adequate idea of these three great historic phases, refraining meanwhile from prejudging the divinity of any of them.

First Phase: Primitive or Patriarchal Religion.

Primitive or patriarchal religion is the supernatural religion which God imposed upon our first parents at the beginning of their existence. It contained dogmas revealed and supernatural—for example, the existence of good and bad angels, and, after the fall, the hope of a liberator; it included also certain positive precepts, such as the observance of the Sabbath, the manner of offering sacrifices.

This religion was binding upon all men; until the coming of Christ it sufficed the human race to attain its end. There was, however, one exception: from the time of Moses, the Jewish people were obliged to practise the Mosaic religion.

Primitive religion was to be preserved in the human race, on the one hand by conscience, which dictated the precepts of the natural law; on the other, by means of tradition or teaching passing from man to man and transmitting the knowledge of truths and of positive precepts added and revealed by God. Unfortunately, men by sin obscured the ideas of the natural law: they no longer read its precepts so clearly in their conscience; they ceased to distinguish so readily the good they should do and the evil they should avoid. The tradition of truths and revealed precepts became altered and corrupted in the course of time.[1]

Then it was that God, in order to preserve the primitive religion in the midst of the erring human race, chose Abraham and his posterity. Through these patriarchs He confirmed and determined the previous revelation; He taught new truths and imposed new precepts, for example the observance of circumcision. Primitive religion received its first development under the patriarchs: hence its double name of primitive and patriarchal.

Second Phase: Mosaic Religion.[2]

Later, as man continued to turn from the path of righteousness, God in His infinite mercy willed to bring him back by new means which would make salvation easier for him, and prepare the way more efficaciously for the Messias, for the Redeemer promised after the fall. He chose Moses and the prophets who followed him to revive the knowledge of the natural law and of previous revelations, and to impose new precepts. This new revelation was made, as we know, on

[1] Thébaud, Gentilism; Ch. and M. W., I., ch. 1; Schanz, II., ch. 1 ff.; Lacordaire, 5th conf. on the Church; Alzog, Ch. Hist., I., hist. introd.

[2] Döllinger, on Judaism; Schanz, II., ch. 5; also Thébaud and Alzog, ll.cc.

Mt. Sinai under circumstances fitted to make a deep and lasting impression on the mind and the heart of the Hebrew people.

The Mosaic religion or law, therefore, is a collection of dogmas and precepts revealed principally to the Hebrew people through Moses and the other prophets who came after him. This law, which was, moreover, only the primitive religion raised to a degree of perfection which it hitherto had not possessed, was not addressed to the whole world like the first, but only to the Jewish people; nor was it destined to embrace all times: its special mission being to prepare the coming of the Messias, it was to last only till this coming. Hence God did not will to perfect it. This perfection, according to the degree determined by the wisdom of the Most High, was reserved for the religion which the Messias was to announce to men.

Third Phase: The Christian Religion.

When the time marked by the eternal decrees was accomplished, the Redeemer promised from the beginning of the world came to redeem men and establish a religion which was called by His name, that is, Christian.[1]

The Christian religion or evangelic law, then, is that which Christ Himself came to give to the world. It contains necessarily, like the others, the truths and precepts of the natural law, but it teaches them in an eminently clear, certain, and perfect manner; it presents, besides, a complete collection of truths, of precepts, and of supernatural aids.

The Christian religion abrogated the Mosaic law in all that was special to the Jewish people, and became the only religion necessary to all men until the end of the world. It will not receive, like those which preceded it, any ulterior development, Christ having given it as perfect as God willed it to be for the salvation of the human race.

Remark.—It follows from what we have said that these

[1] Schanz, II., ch. 7.

three religions, the Primitive, the Mosaic, and the Christian, though different exteriorly, are *one* and *the same religion*, developed by God in the course of centuries. In fact, they all three have the same author, God; the same supernatural end, the beatific vision; the same fundamental means, supernatural grace for the intelligence and the will; all three rest on a Redeemer who is to come or has come; the decalogue is common to them; the dogmas, though revealed progressively, are found, at least in germ, and frequently entire, in the three religions. Hence it is undoubtedly the same religion which has passed through two preparatory phases in order to receive finally in the Christian revelation its crown and its definite perfection.

Conclusion.—Such are the facts attested by history and the traditions of the nations. It remains now to learn whether, in each of these three phases, this religion, venerable certainly in its antiquity, is legitimately entitled to claim, to the exclusion of all others, a *supernatural and divine origin*. Is it really God who, by Himself or by means of His representatives, revealed and imposed it on man? This, let us repeat, is what we propose to examine in the first part of this course.

It will not be necessary, however, to establish the proof of this divine origin for each of these three phases. It follows from the preceding exposition that the religion which Jesus Christ brought into the world is, and will be until the end of time, the religion which all men must embrace in order to be saved: the essential point, then, is to prove the *divinity of the Christian religion*. This is what we are about to do.

Later we could, by following an analogous method, establish the divinity of these two anterior religious phases. But we refrain in order not to overburden our work with proofs, particularly as, the divinity of Christ's mission being once established, it will be easy, if necessary, to prove the divinity of these two preceding revelations: the solemn affirmation of Christ on the subject would be amply sufficient.

ART. II.—EXAMINATION OF THREE PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS.

Before attempting to demonstrate the divinity of the Christian Religion, it will be well to elucidate three questions, or, if you will, to reply to three objections which are stumbling-blocks to many minds in search of religious truth. The first concerns the rôle which reason plays in the matters of faith, or supernatural religion; the second, the mysteries which this religion contains; the third, finally, the means by which reason establishes with certainty the existence of a divine revelation.

I. The Rôle of Reason in Matters of Faith.[1]

Rationalism claims that revelation, or faith in a divine authority, annihilates reason or renders it absolutely useless. Nothing is more utterly false than this assertion, as we have already shown above, p. 29f.

1st. The Vatican Council, l. c., ch. 4th, speaking of the relations between faith and reason, uses these words: "The Catholic Church has always held, and holds by perpetual consent, that there exist two orders of knowledge, distinct in their principle and in their object. In their *principle*, because in one we know by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith. In their *object*, because outside of things to which natural reason may attain, there are mysteries hidden in God, which are proposed to our belief, and which could not be known to us, if they were not divinely revealed." Later on it says further: "Though faith is above reason there can never be any real disagreement between faith and reason, for the same God, who revealed the mysteries and communicated faith, has given to the human mind the light of reason, and God cannot contradict Himself, nor can truth ever deny truth. . . .

[1] Lacordaire's Conf., 11–13, on the Doctrine of the Church; 14–20, on Catholic Doctrine and the Mind; Ronayne; Archbp. Vaughan;

"Not only can faith and reason never disagree, but they afford each other a mutual assistance; right reason *demonstrates* the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by the light of this faith, *develops* the knowledge of divine things; faith, on her part, delivers and guards the reason from error and enriches it with divers kinds of knowledge. Hence the Church, so far from being opposed to the study of the arts and human sciences commends such study and furthers it in a thousand ways." Certainly nothing could be more clearly and formally expressed. The same doctrine is fully stated in the Encyclical of Leo XIII., on Thomistic philosophy.

2d. This doctrine of the Church is in conformity with *Scripture.* So far from exacting blind faith of us, God even forbids us to give premature or unjustifiable credence to any word claimed to have come from heaven. "*Qui credit cito, levis est corde:* He that is hasty to give credit, is light of heart," says Ecclesiasticus xix. 4. The Apostle St. John in his turn also warns us against unreflecting impulse which leads direct to error: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." (1 John iv. 1.) St. Paul gives the same recommendation to the Thessalonians: "Despise not prophecies. But prove all things: hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. v. 20, 21.) By means of this wise discernment we shall be always ready, as St. Peter tells us, "to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you." (1 Pet. iii. 15.)

3d. *Catholic Theology* teaches the same. It is many years since St. Thomas, the Angel of the schools, formulated the doctrine of the Church in these terms: "Reason would not believe, if it did not see that it must believe." He only repeated, moreover, what St. Augustine wrote on the subject

Preston, Reason and Revel.; Gibbons, Ch. H.; Hunter, I.; D. R., III. Ser. xiv. 243, xxi. 87, xxii. 72, Oct. 1900; Br. W. iii. (passim), viii. 574, ix. 235, 268; C. W., xxi. 178, xxxiii. 289, xxxviii. 577, lxxii.; A. C. Q., vi. 300, xiii. 1, xvi. 1; M., June, Sept. 1899; I. E. R., Feb 1900; U. B., Jan. 1895.

in his letter to Consentius: "The Church exacts faith; and because we have so many reasons to believe, strong and urgent reasons, she requires faith and humble submission to all her divine teachings. Let her not be accused, then, of requiring an absolute, blind, unreasoning faith, or of insisting that those who, in order to believe, have used their reason in the salutary manner we have indicated, may not continue to use their reason to render their faith ever more humble, but also ever more enlightened. God forbid that our submission to all that is of faith, should prevent us from searching and asking the reason of what we believe, since we *could not even believe if we were not capable of reasoning!*" Evidently any revelation made by God to mankind supposes in man the corresponding capacity of knowing. In this very course of apologetics, to what power of the mind do we appeal if not to reason? "Christian faith," says Bourdaloue, "is not any acquiescence to believe or any submission of the mind whatever; it is a *rational* assent, otherwise it were no longer a virtue. But how can this submission be rational, if reason has no part in it? What are the proofs that will show me the religion I profess and the mysteries it teaches to be evidently credible? This is the important question which I must endeavor to grasp, and by careful study to understand; here I must bring my reason into active play, for in this matter I am not allowed to say: I shall not reason. Without this strict examination and discussion my faith will be uncertain, wavering, and vague, without principle and without consistency." [1]

Conclusion.—Hence it is incontestable, not only that Catholic teaching accords reason a special object, distinct from that of faith, but that even in the things of faith, this reason fills an important and serious rôle. One part of this rôle is to establish harmony between the various revealed truths, to show the link which unites them, to prove each one by fitting arguments, and to deduce the consequences

[1] Rickaby, Oxf. Conf., I. S., ch. 9.

which follow from them; in a word, to make these truths a *scientific whole;* this is what the Council calls developing the science of divine things. This is certainly a very beautiful rôle, but there is another much more important, viz., demonstrating the truth of the Gospel, that is, establishing with certainty the foundations of faith by demonstrating that it is perfectly rational, legitimate, and indispensable to believe. According to the Vatican Council and the Encyclical of Leo XIII. already quoted, it belongs to reason to give this demonstration, and we are not permitted, under pain of erring against faith, to deny it this right and power. Let us add finally, that it also devolves upon reason to defend revealed truths against the attacks of their enemies. "Philosophy," says the same Pope, "bears a noble and honorable title as the bulwark of faith and the firm rampart of religion."

What more could they who proclaim themselves the champions of human reason ask? No; it is no longer possible to claim with any appearance of truth that the Catholic Church does not recognize the rights of reason, that she endeavors to crush reason under the weight of authority. It belongs to reason to prove that God has spoken to men to instruct them in religion and their duties; but, once this is established, it is undeniably the duty of reason to bow before the sovereign authority of God, to admit His revealed word, in short, to believe according to His infallible testimony.

Remark.—It by no means follows from what we have said that reason *directly produces* faith. Faith is a supernatural gift; a virtue by which we firmly believe the truths revealed by God, because He has revealed them. Now, evidently the natural cannot produce the supernatural; hence reason only prepares the way for faith by examining the *motives of belief.* Thus, an unbeliever or a heretic who, by examining these motives, is convinced of their soundness, and, consequently, of the necessity of giving his assent to revealed truths, has only a wholly human belief; in order that his belief become

a divine faith he requires that a supernatural principle, that grace lead him to believe these truths as revealed, that is, on the infallible authority of God.[1] Let us hasten to add that, according to the theological axiom, *facienti quod est in se Deus non denegat gratiam*, this divine assistance, enlightenment of the mind, and impulse of the will, is never refused to a man of good will, that is, to one who is perfectly sincere in seeking religious truth. Such a man, moreover, would never fail to implore the divine assistance by humble, confident prayer.

II. The Mysteries of Religion.

Among the truths which God has revealed there are *mysteries*, that is, points of doctrine which reason, of itself, could never have discovered, nor can it penetrate their essence or intimate nature, but it admits their existence on the supreme and infallible authority of God. These truths, moreover, are far from being unintelligible to us; we understand them sufficiently to speak of them intelligently, to avoid confounding them with others, and to derive from them salutary and persuasive lessons of conduct.

Is it true, as rationalists claim, that the existence of these mysteries is a sufficient reason for rejecting a priori, that is, without further examination, as false, a religion which proposes them for our belief? Is it necessary to *understand* a truth *in itself* in its essence, in other words, to know perfectly the *why* and *wherefore* of its existence, in order that one may believe it without sinning against reason? By no means, nor does it redound to the credit of human intelligence that we need to refute anything so absurd and yet so general.

Thesis. — It is in no way contrary to reason, rather it is wholly in accordance with reason, to believe the mysteries of religion, once we are certain that they are revealed by God.

[1] On the Grace of Faith, see Rickaby, Oxf. C., I. S., ch. 8, 10; Manning, Int. Miss., ch. 3; Lacordaire, conf. 13 on Doctr. of the Ch.

First Argument.—If we were to reject the mysteries of religion because we have not a perfect, an adequate knowledge of them, because we do not know or clearly understand the why and wherefore of their existence, we should be obliged for the same reason to reject all the mysteries of nature. "We have no complete knowledge of any thing," Pascal has truly said; and this profound thinker goes so far as to define science: "Learning which recognizes its ignorance." Is there a scholar who completely understands even the simplest natural phenomena? Who has ever thoroughly grasped the intimate nature of heat and cold, of light, of attraction, of electricity? Who understands time, space, the infinite, eternity? Who understands the nature of a simple grain of sand, the germination of plants, life, sleep, fatigue, pleasure, death? Who understands the substantial union in us of spirit and matter, the intercourse of souls, the reciprocal communication of their thoughts, their sentiments, their desires by a vehicle wholly material, speech or writing? Who understands what takes place in each of our senses, and innumerable other things? Yet these are truths which all the world admits, though the essence of these things escape us and we have of the truths themselves only very imperfect ideas mingled with impenetrable obscurities.

Now, if it is not contrary to reason to believe these mysteries of *nature* because their existence is confirmed by the senses and experience, how can it be contrary to reason to admit mysterious truths of a *religious nature* when a witness whose authority is irrecusable, God Himself, attests them. No doubt reason must, as we have said, prove the reality of this testimony; but, once this is established, reason itself makes it a duty for us to assent without hesitation. The most noble use man can make of his reason is to submit it to God, the Infinite Wisdom.

Second Argument.—If it were contrary to reason to believe on reliable testimony truths, the essence of which is impenetrable to reason, we should be obliged to say that

it was repugnant to the reason of an unlettered man to admit, on the testimony of a scholar, the majority of things which the latter teaches him. In fact scientists undoubtedly possess certain knowledge of many things which are beyond the intelligence of ordinary minds, and which not only seem to them inadmissible, but contrary to what they believe they daily witness; for example, that the earth turns round the sun, that a certain star is a million times larger than the earth, that it takes thousands of years for its light to reach us, that it contains certain constituent elements. Would this unlettered man be acting contrary to reason in accepting the testimony of a scientist worthy of belief? Would it be unreasonable or imprudent for a son, blind from his birth, to believe with entire faith and perfect confidence whatsoever his father, whose wisdom and affection he had a thousand times experienced, tells him of the wonders his eyes discover by means of the telescope? Yet does he comprehend anything whatever of the manner in which these distant objects are presented to his father's vision? How, then, can it be unreasonable for a Christian to believe mysteries on the testimony of Him who is Truth itself?

THIRD ARGUMENT.—God, infinite Intelligence, must evidently *know* the truths which are beyond the natural power of man's limited intelligence. On the other hand, it may be most profitable for us to be instructed concerning the existence of these truths in order to know God's designs, His acts of goodness, of mercy, of justice in behalf of humanity; in order to have an adequate idea of these things, without, however, comprehending them, or penetrating the intimate nature of them. Finally, He who has given man ears to hear, intelligence to understand, and speech to communicate his thoughts to his fellow-men, surely does not lack means of imparting to His creature these elevating and salutary truths.

REMARKS.—We would add to these arguments a few remarks which will confirm what we have advanced by removing all misapprehension.

1st. The difficulty we experience in believing the mysteries of religion is frequently due to the fact that we form an erroneous idea of them. If, for example, in regard to the mystery of the Trinity, we were asked to believe that three distinct natures are but one and the same nature, or that three distinct persons are but one person, this dogma would be evidently contrary to reason and consequently inadmissible. In fact, reason shows us clearly that one cannot be the same as three. But such is not the mystery revealed. If it is above reason, it is in no way contrary to it; nor does it contradict the immutable principles which reason reveals to us. Religion, in fact, says only that the three Persons in God are but one nature. The unity and trinity are not affirmed under the same relations but under different relations: the unity concerns the nature, while the trinity is affirmed of the persons. No doubt our limited intelligence could not of itself discover this mysterious truth, the object of which is the intimate nature of an infinite being; but there is nothing opposed to our believing it on the authentic testimony of God Himself.

What we have just said of the mystery of the Holy Trinity applies to that of the Incarnation and to all other mysteries. All are, it is true, *beyond* reason in the sense indicated above, but none are *contrary* to reason.[1]

2d. Mysteries, to a reasoning man, are far from being an obstacle to admitting a religion which contains them; their very existence is a presumption in its favor. The absence of all mystery should, on the contrary, make its authenticity doubtful. In fact, reason, as we have just seen, finds impenetrable obscurities even in the sphere of natural truths; everywhere it finds itself forced to recognize, and accept as certain, things which are obscure and incomprehensible. Why, then, should we not encounter obscurities and incomprehensibilities in religion, that is, in the relations between

[1] Newman, Discourses to Mixed Congregat., xiii., xiv., xv.; Br. W., viii 28; M. 1902, Nov., Dec.

God and man? How can our finite intelligence fathom the unsearchable depth of an infinite being? Should we not justly regard as insensate a man who would dare to say: "I am capable of knowing God as far as He can be known, as far as He knows Himself; I can penetrate His nature and His perfections, His will and His acts in regard to man; there is nothing in their infinity, in their eternity, in their supreme elevation, which is beyond or impenetrable to my reason"?[1]

The reply which we shall give to the following question will further confirm what we have said on the subject of belief in mysteries. We shall see that there are innumerable facts and truths to which we accord reasonable belief without any direct knowledge of them and without understanding their intimate nature.

III. The Criterion of Certainty in Matters of Faith.

We have seen but a short time since that it belongs to reason to prove not only that it is not absurd to believe revealed truths, but that it is insensate and impious not to believe all that God, infinite Intelligence and infallible Truth, has deigned to reveal to man, even mysteries. But we may ask ourselves how reason succeeds in establishing these *grounds of faith*, how it proves to itself that God has revealed to man certain truths and certain precepts, with the obligation to believe them and conform his life thereto?

Philosophy mentions different means or sources of attaining *certain* knowledge which rests in every case upon evidence.[2] These sources are experience, reason, and testimony.

1st. *Experience* may be either internal or external. The first, by the help of the *internal sense*, or consciousness, perceives immediately our subjective modifications, our internal and personal acts and facts, whether of the mind or the will or the whole human compound. The latter, by

[1] Lacordaire, 5th conf. on God and Man.

[2] Rickaby, First Principles of Knowledge; Mivart, Nature and Thought, ch. 2; Poland, The Truth of Thought.

means of the *external senses* and the impressions made upon them by external objects, makes us know these objects, the existence of bodies, their qualities and properties, and in this way reveals to us the material world and its wonderful changes and motions.

2d. *Reason* works upon the material supplied by experience; it penetrates the nature of things and discovers the relations which exist between the various beings. The acts we thus perform are of two kinds: (a) acts of intelligence, by which we perceive at a glance universal, necessary, immutable truths, the denial of which would imply contradiction—for example, that the whole is greater than one of its parts; that that which exists is possible; that a thing cannot at the same time exist and not exist; (b) acts of reasoning, by which we deduce certain ideas from other ideas, conclusions from their principles. Reason enables us to infer from the existence of a finite, contingent world the existence of God, a necessary being and first cause of all things.

3d. *Testimony* or authority gives us a knowledge of beings and events of which, being separated from them by time or space, we can have no experience; thus by means of testimony we attain the certain knowledge of historical and geographical facts, such as the exploits of Alexander, the existence of San Francisco, Thibet.[1]

It is important to observe here that each of these three means enables us to attain perfect certainty. I am absolutely certain of the existence of my body, of the reality of the things I see or touch, of the existence of the universe, in a word, of all the things coming under my own experience. I am absolutely certain that every effect has a cause, that God exists, etc., though these truths are beyond the reach of experience. I am equally certain of the conquests of Cæsar, the victories of Napoleon, the existence of Rome, and an infinite number of facts in history, geography, and natural science. Under pain of being unreasonable I

[1] Fitz-Arthur; Rickaby, l. c., p. 377 ff.; Poland, l. c., ch. 14.

must admit these facts on the strength of testimony worthy of belief.

It is true that truths proved by testimony do not induce the assent of the intelligence as irresistibly as truths of immediate intuition, such as axioms; but, on the other hand, it would be absurd to exact this immediate and irresistible evidence when there is question of historical and geographical truths, and in general of remote objects or exterior facts which the senses cannot attain; at the same time it is evident that these truths are no less certain.

Evidence is what determines the assent of our intelligence to a tenet or truth. Now this evidence may be intrinsic (internal), that is, inherent in the tenet or doctrine itself; or it may be extrinsic (external), in which case it may be called the evidence of the *credibility* of the doctrine proposed. Let us explain. Certain doctrines or propositions brought before our intelligence are themselves endowed with such a clear light that the mind without denying, in a measure, its own nature cannot refuse to admit their truth. Such is, for instance, that first principle: A thing cannot at the same time be and not be. With other propositions there may be need of a long process of reasoning (argument) before we perceive their truth. Of this kind are many propositions in algebra and geometry. However, by the very fact that our mind clearly sees the intimate connection of these theorems with evident principles the conclusion itself becomes evident. Finally, there are other propositions or tenets for which our assent is asked, although they do not show forth that light of evidence. Do what we may, they remain for us enshrouded in obscurity and mystery. But suppose men of irreproachable probity assure me that they have heard these propositions from the mouth of God, suppose I am certain that they speak without any personal interest whatever; nay, more, for the truth which they proclaim they suffer insults, persecution and death itself, while, on the other hand, their teaching is confirmed

by striking and incontestable miracles. Would it not be unreasonable, under these circumstances, to refuse my assent to their doctrines?

Another important remark. If the internal evidence shining forth in certain metaphysical and mathematical truths were always required to justify our intelligence in giving a firm assent, there would be no longer any historical, geographical, and natural sciences, for the simple reason that the facts or results of these sciences consist mostly of knowledge acquired by means of *testimony* (extrinsic evidence). What scientist has ever by his own personal experience verified all the facts related in scientific works and accepted by him as undoubtedly true. If he honestly analyzes the reasons of his convictions, will he dare to affirm that all of them rest upon evidence free from the slightest cloud?

Conclusion.—Let us now apply what we have just said to the question of revelation or supernatural religion. Revelation is a fact, an exterior act dependent on the will of God; furthermore, it is a fact removed from us by many centuries. Hence it is authority or testimony which enables us to attain certain knowledge of revelation and, consequently, to *demonstrate the foundations of faith.*[1]

Remarks.—1st. According to the definition of the Vatican Council, faith is a supernatural virtue whereby, inspired and assisted by God's grace, we believe as true the things which He has revealed, not because we perceive their intrinsic truth by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself who has revealed them, and who can neither be deceived nor deceive (C. I. ch. 3). Faith, like every virtue, is a principle of free acts which are meritorious before God. Yet faith is an act of the intellect, and the intellect is not a free power: its assent is neces-

[1] Hettinger, Nat. Rel. (Introduct.); Brann, Truth and Error; Ward, Theism, I. pp. 1, 120, II. pp. 107, 244; C. W. xxix. 11; D. R., Oct. '92, p. 365; Chatard, Essay 19; Newman, Discourses to Mixed Congr., x., xi.; Manning, The Grounds of Faith, lect. 1.

sarily determined by evidence. The explanation of this apparent difficulty is that free-will enters largely into the birth and development of a supernatural act of faith: this is what makes the act the homage of human reason to the Divine Wisdom.

It may be well to explain one of the ways by which man's free-will intervenes in an act of faith. We have only to observe our own mental activity, however briefly, to see that few truths are privileged to produce certainty by means of absolute evidence which convinces the reason. There is much knowledge rightly called certain in which, however, this character of certainty is not evident. Facts, sometimes, present luminous sides, while other parts are obscured by shadows. This obscurity wearies and disconcerts our intelligence, and our first impulse, yielding to a movement of pride, is simply to reject a truth which is not clearly and completely revealed to us. Here is where the will intervenes to oblige our intelligence, despite its repugnance, to accept truths, which though not completely evident, are presented with sufficient clearness to leave no room for *prudent* doubt. In very many cases this intervention of the will in the act of cognition takes place spontaneously. There are many special facts in regard to which no one would venture to claim that he is guided only by complete and infallible evidence. The affirmation of our senses and the testimony of our fellow men constantly form for us the starting point or basis of the most important resolutions. To reject whatsoever is not sustained by absolute evidence would be to condemn one's self to the most desolate scepticism.

The application of the foregoing explanation to the truths of revelation follows of itself. As many of these truths are not self-evident, and yet the assent of our intelligence thereto is required by God, it is the duty of the will to intervene in order to oblige our reason to accept the truths on testimony recognized to be from God.[1]

[1] Ward, The Wish to Believe; Hedley, The Spirit of Faith; Manning,

The necessity of this intervention of the free-will appears more clearly still when we consider the difficulties in the way of the *firm and persevering assent* demanded by divine revelation. In order to believe man must often conquer three enemies at the same time: pride, which revolts against the acceptance of truths which reason cannot understand; the terror of sensual passions, which tremble in view of the chains to be imposed on them by the practical truths of faith; the tyranny of human respect, and the fear of the dangers and sacrifices to which the public profession of the Catholic faith often exposes its followers. We can easily understand that under such conditions the intellect as well as the will stand in need of supernatural help, of that spiritual power which in the Christian language is called the grace, the light, or *the gift of faith.*

2d. From what has been said, it follows that when arguing with unbelievers we must never promise to satisfy their loud demand for absolute evidence of revealed truths. This would be to forget the essential character of Catholic faith. What we may stoutly maintain is, first, the perfect satisfaction that our dogmas, even the most mysterious, offer to the demands of the highest and most exacting intellect; secondly, the authenticity, integrity, and truthfulness of our sacred books, particularly of the Gospels, as perfect as that of the most reliable historical documents; finally, the divine character of the Christian religion and the Catholic Church shown in each motive of credibility and shining forth in real splendor from the full cluster of all these motives. Moreover, it can be shown most clearly—with a clearness approaching absolute evidence—that the unbelief of the rationalist is contrary to sound reason, that it brings misery to its followers, and that it constitutes one of the most serious dangers threatening the individual as well as society. What more can a rational mind demand?

Internal Mission; Lacordaire, 6th conf. on God and Man, 13th conf. on the Church; Br. W. v. 496 ff.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORIC VALUE OF THE BIBLE.

Supernatural religion supposes a divine revelation, which in turn establishes the truth of that supernatural religion. But revelation, being an historical fact, must be proved by *testimony* carrying with it certainty. Where shall we find these unimpeachable testimonies of God's successive communications with man? They are contained in the holy books written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and for this reason enjoying for long centuries an exceptional and well-deserved veneration.[1] Collectively they are called "The Holy Scriptures" or "The Bible," and are divided into the Old and New Testaments.[2]

The Old Testament.—The name Old Testament is given to the inspired books written before the coming of Christ. They are forty-five in number, and may be divided into four classes.

1st. The *historical* books, which relate the history of religion from the creation to the time of Christ. The principal one of these is the Pentateuch of Moses, containing five parts or books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. It includes the period which elapsed between the

[1] *Tradition* is another source from which the Church draws her knowledge of revealed truths. We shall speak of it shortly in the 2d part, ch. 2, art. 2, IV.

[2] See the beautiful 10th conf. by Lacordaire (on the Church), about the Bible and pagan sacred books. On the inspiration, canonicity, authenticity, and integrity of the Bible and its separate books consult the so-called "Introductions to the Sacred Scriptures" by Gigot, Breen, Dixon, and MacDevitt.

creation and the death of Moses. Then come the other historical books which resume this history at the period of the entrance to the promised land and carry it on to the coming of the Redeemer. These are the book of Josue; that of Judges; the four books of Kings; the two books of Paralipomenon; the two books of Esdras, the second of which is also called Nehemias, and the two books of Maccabees. Besides this general history, there are five books which contain only special histories: such are the books of Job, Ruth, Esther, Tobias, and Judith.

2d. The books of *praise*, or chants addressed to the Divinity: these are the Psalms and the Canticle of Canticles.

3d. The books of *morals*, which give rules for the conduct of life: these are Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.

4th. The books of the *Prophets*, which reprove the people for their vices, predict the chastisements which threaten them, and above all, announce the coming of the Messias. The Prophets are sixteen in number: Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch, Ezechiel and Daniel, the four principal ones, are called the great Prophets because of the importance of their works. The others, who because of their lesser works are called the minor Prophets, are twelve in number: Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias.

The New Testament.—The New Testament is composed of inspired books written *after* the coming of Christ and at the time of the Apostles. They include twenty-seven books which we divide into four categories.

1st. *The Gospels*, which contain the history of the life and of the ministry of Jesus Christ, His doctrine, His death and His resurrection. These Gospels, which are four in number, have respectively, as authors, St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John.

2d. *The Acts of the Apostles*, that is, the relation of the acts of the Apostles, of what they did to establish and promulgate

the Gospel. This narration, the author of which is the Evangelist St. Luke, the disciple of St. Paul, goes as far as the first captivity of St. Paul at Rome.

3d. *The Epistles*, or letters of the Apostles written to the different churches, and even to individuals, to give them counsel and to instruct them. We count fourteen of St. Paul, three of St. John, two of St. Peter, one of St. James and one of St. Jude.

4th. The *Apocalypse* or revelation made to St. John in the Island of Patmos.

Inspiration of the Bible. Our Present Point of View.—It is extremely important to determine very accurately the point of view from which we here regard the Holy Scriptures, particularly the Pentateuch and the Gospels. In the eyes of a Catholic all the books just mentioned have a sacred character. They are given him by the Church as divinely inspired, that is, dictated by the Holy Ghost to the biblical writers. Therefore, God Himself is their author. To avoid any errors on this subject let us state briefly what the Catholic Church means by this *inspiration*.[1] God by an efficacious influence, either exterior or interior, impels a man to write; He makes known, with more or less detail, the things He wishes written by the hand of this man, and, while the writer is laboring to execute the divine idea, the Holy Spirit assists and guides him that there may be nothing in his writing contrary to the designs of Him whose instrument he is. At the same time this man is, under God's hand, a *living* instrument endowed with intelligence and will; and God, in employing him, does not prohibit him the exercise of this double faculty. That is to say, He permits man to conceive after his own manner the divine thought which He communicates to him, and to choose the manner which suits

[1] Manning, Essays, II. Ser.; Humphrey, Written Word, ch. 1, 2; U.B., Apr. '97; D. R. III. Ser. xx. 144, July '93, p. 532; C. W. xxxiii. 523, lvi. 742, lvii. 206, 396; Br. W. vi. 427; I. E. R., Jan., Mch. '95; Walworth, ch. 17; Schanz, II., ch. 13; Hunter, I.; Gigot, lect. 10.

him to express it; one thing is guaranteed by the divine Author: that His thought shall be faithfully rendered by the hagiographer. At times, it is true, God dictates to man the very words by which the divine thought must be expressed; but usually these words and the arrangement of the details of the inspired writing are left to the choice of the writer under the direction and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. At times God's thought is manifested to the writer without any effort on his part; at other times He wishes that the author contribute personally by preliminary or concomitant labor to the conception of the divine idea. He in no way prohibits the author, for example, from making use, while engaged in his historic labor, of preexisting records, from having recourse to his memory, from making researches, from questioning witnesses of events. Every proposition thus written under divine inspiration, is the word of God, the truth of which is infallible. Hence the Bible as a whole as well as in all its parts is invested with divine authority.—Leo XIII., Encyclical on the Holy Scriptures.

It is not to this divine authority, however, that we shall appeal in the studies which follow. The apologist, proposing to establish the premises of faith, cannot appeal to inspiration, the existence of which is affirmed only by faith and the infallible teaching of the Church. Therefore, we must completely set aside, for the moment, the divine inspiration of the sacred books and consider only their *historic value;* the same as if we were considering the Commentaries of Cæsar or the Annals of Tacitus. Do those sacred books, simply as historic documents, deserve our full and entire confidence? We insist that, thus regarded, the books of both the Old and the New Testament possess an authority so certain, so well established that we cannot doubt it without absolutely denying all historic certainty. This is what we shall first demonstrate.[1]

[1] Gigot, lect. 2.

ART. I.—AUTHORITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.[1]

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATION.—If an historical book is to be an unimpeachable authority and command our confidence, three conditions are necessary. It must be:

1st. *Authentic*, that is, written by the author to whom it is attributed, or, if the author is unknown or doubtful, at the period assigned to it.

2d. *Intact*, that is, it must have come to us just as it left the pen of the author, without having undergone any substantial alteration bearing on the main subject of the history.

3d. *Truthful:* the moral qualities of the author and the circumstances under which it was written should protect it against all suspicion of error or falsehood. When an historical work fills these three conditions, no reasonable man can refuse to admit the facts contained therein. Now such are the books which compose the Holy Scripture. We are about to establish this specially, in regard to the Pentateuch,[2]

[1] If we had only simplicity of method in view, there would be reason to ask if it were opportune to treat here the questions contained in the two articles which follow, particularly in article 2d. Undoubtedly, if our only object were to make the divinity of the Christian religion very clear, we should not hesitate to omit this discussion, for the New Testament would be amply sufficient for our purpose. But we deem these pages useful in other respects. If, however, a reader lacks time to study seriously the whole Course, he may, without detriment to the soundness of the general demonstration, pass over article 3d of the present chapter. It is true that among the proofs which we give of the divinity of Christianity there is one very important which rests on the fulfilment in Jesus Christ of the Messianic prophecies; but in order that this proof preserve all its apologetic value, it is enough that we be perfectly certain that these prophecies existed and were known long before they were fulfilled. Now, of this there can be no doubt; every one knows that the Greek version of the Septuagint had spread the knowledge of them everywhere, more than 250 years before Christ.

[2] Bissell; Thein, The Bible and Rationalism, p. I.; Schanz, II., ch. 12; Walworth, ch. 3 ff.; Burnett, Why, etc., ch. 9, 10; D. R., Apr. '92, p. 264, Oct. '92, p. 245, Jan. '93, p. 40; M. S. H. 1900.

the most important of the historical books of the Old Testament, containing as it does the account of the creation, the fall, etc. We shall do the same afterward for the Gospels, the principal historic basis of the Christian Revelation. As for the other books of the Old as well as the New Testament, which will be less useful to us in this treatise, analogous proofs may be found in special works.[1]

I. Authenticity of the Pentateuch.

Thesis. The Pentateuch is the work of Moses, the Lawgiver of the Hebrews.

First Argument.—The authenticity of the Pentateuch is superabundantly proved:

1st. By the traditional testimony, as unanimous as constant, of ancient and modern Jews. After their departure from Egypt, these books were always in the hands of the whole nation, and they always insisted that they were the work of Moses, who had delivered them from the bondage of Egypt. Moreover, all the sacred writers, from Moses to Jesus Christ, cite or pre-suppose the Pentateuch of Moses to have come from him. It is the same with the profane writers of the nation, such as Philo and Josephus, and all the Talmudists and Rabbins. Finally, in our own day also, the Jews, who, by a phenomenon unique in history, continue to exist though scattered throughout all the nations of the world, certify the same thing to us, though these books condemn them.

2d. By the testimony of the Samaritans, who, despite their profound hatred of the Jews, preserved the Pentateuch and never ceased to attribute it to Moses; whence we must conclude that at the *time of the separation* of the ten tribes, about a thousand years before Christ, its authenticity must have been incontestably and universally acknowledged.

3d. By the testimony of a multitude of other writers

[1] *On Biblical Criticism* see A. C. Q. xix. 412, 562; I. E. R., 1892, '93, '94, 1901, 1902; M. S. H., 1900; Wiseman, Science and Rev. Rel., I. 10.

among the nations of antiquity, Pagan, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, etc., who admitted the Pentateuch as the work of Moses and as containing his legislation. Even Celsus, Porphyrius, and Julian the Apostate, though it was their capital interest to deny the authenticity of this book, never accused the Jews or the Christians of supporting their doctrines with apocryphal documents.

4th. By the testimony of Jesus Christ and the Apostles: whenever they name the Pentateuch or the Law they attribute it to Moses.[1] Let us add further the testimony of all Christians whether Catholics or heretics.

These *extrinsic* proofs based on testimony are amply sufficient. If we admit the authenticity of Virgil's Æneid, of the Philippics of Demosthenes, etc., on the faith of testimony, we cannot reasonably deny the authenticity of the Pentateuch, attested by just as great a number of unassailable witnesses. Let us add, however, other arguments which are equally significant, and, first of all, an *intrinsic* proof, drawn from a careful study of the text itself.

Second Argument.—All that the Pentateuch contains in point of religion, of history, of politics, of geography, of morals, of customs, reveals the great antiquity of the book, and is in perfect harmony with the time of Moses; this minute accuracy in the very circumstantial narrations, abounding with a multitude of details fully verified by the study of the Egyptian monuments, could not be explained at a less ancient period. Thus what he tells of Egypt when speaking of the sojourn of the Hebrews there and their flight agrees perfectly with the condition of the country under Ramses, a condition quite different from what it was at a later period, e. g. of Solomon or the prophets. What we shall say later on (p. 130) of modern discoveries in Egypt and Assyria goes to show that such exactness in the smallest details points necessarily to an author who lived at the time and the places of which he speaks. Let us observe, however

[1] See, e.g., Luke xxiv. 27; John v. 46.

that there is a small number of supplementary details which were added after the death of Moses, the chief of which is the story of the death of the Lawgiver himself (Deuter. xxxiv.). The study of language leads to the same conclusion. Without entering into particulars, which space does not permit, we would merely observe that the books of Moses possess an inimitable character of poetry, originality, and simplicity, which give a special impression of antiquity. The antiquity of the language is apparent in several archaisms, such as the absence of any distinction between the masculine and feminine genders in the third person of the personal pronoun. The masculine inflection takes the place of the feminine in 195 passages of the Pentateuch, while in the book of Josue the distinction between the genders appears to be fully established. Another characteristic: the only strange words found in the Pentateuch are Egyptian. Finally, it is important to observe that the general unity which characterizes the five books of the Pentateuch indicates one and the same author. The style of Moses is moreover very personal and very succinct.[1]

It would be ridiculous to-day to object that writing was not invented at that time, particularly in the face of recent discoveries which show us that the art of writing was known in Egypt at least two centuries before the time of Moses.

THIRD ARGUMENT.—There is question here of a book that is both national and religious, of a book which contains the

[1] Certain rationalists of the present day, headed by Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Reuss, acknowledge Moses as the author of the decalogue, but refuse to see in the Pentateuch anything but fragments, documents of various authors and epochs, compiled by an awkward hand, perhaps by Esdras. They display much erudition in defence of their system; but, on close examination, the want of logic in their demonstrations is very evident; arbitrary decision and prejudice are evident at every step. See Vigouroux, *Les livres saints et la critique rationaliste*, tome 3. It is admitted, however, that Moses inserted in Genesis, with little or no alteration, certain oral traditions and even certain written fragments, the authenticity of which was known to him. This is not the place to give the reasons for this supposition.

legislation itself of the Jewish people, the sum of their laws, religious, political, civil, and military; of a book by which the religion, the police, the morals of this people were regulated with much precision and detail. It is absolutely improbable that a book of this kind could be apocryphal. We might just as well say that the Code Napoleon is falsely assigned to the emperor whose name it bears, or that the American constitution was not framed by the delegates of the United States.

II. Integrity of the Pentateuch.

First Argument.—Let us observe, first, that the greater part of the arguments which go to prove the authenticity of the Pentateuch makes the integrity of the work equally clear, at least in the sense that nothing substantial has been added. Yet there is no want of special proofs. Studies made of this subject, particularly those of Kennicot, which embraced 581 manuscripts, and those of J. B. Rossi, which included 825 others, demonstrate that we possess in its integrity the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Nor has it, moreover, been possible to produce any evidence capable of weakening the constant and public tradition of the Jews relative to integrity of the Holy Scriptures.

Second Argument.—Any essential alteration would have been impossible. In fact,

a. According to the testimony of Flavius Josephus, the Pentateuch was so familiar to the Jews that they even knew how many times each letter was repeated in the volume. "No one," he says, "would have dared to add or take from it, or to make the slightest change in the work. We hold them to be divine, we so call them, we promise to observe them faithfully, and gladly to die, if necessary, in their defence."

b. This book being the foundation of the life of the Jews, any change in it would necessarily have entailed change in

their beliefs, their moral code, their laws and their customs which could not fail to excite earnest protest.[1]

c. It is evident that any alteration was still more impossible after the separation of the ten tribes.

d. Finally, we have a still stronger guarantee in the Greek translation of the *Septuagint* which was made, according to the most probable opinion, by order of the king of Egypt, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and which was known throughout the entire world from the year 277 before Christ, that is, *long before the fulfilment* of the prophecies relating to the Messias.

III. Veracity of the Pentateuch.

Moses is veracious if he was not deceived, or if he did not wish to deceive. This will be still more evident if we prove that he could not deceive.

1st. Moses *was not deceived.*

a. In regard to the events of his time, that is to say, in regard to those related in the last four books of the Pentateuch, Moses was in a position to know them, since they were tangible events and of extreme importance, events also in which he himself was actor or witness, and which he prepared, directed, or accomplished.

b. He derived authentic knowledge of *anterior* events from living tradition, the preservation of which was favored by the longevity of the first men. Though we may, with reason, attribute to providential intervention the perfect preservation of these patriarchal traditions, yet we have no need, in order to explain it, to have recourse to miracles properly so called. In fact the events related by Moses were well known and of the greatest importance; there are several the memory of which is perpetuated, according to the custom of the times, by canticles, by inscriptions, and by monuments raised to commemorate them.

2d. Moses *did not wish to deceive.*

a. History and tradition agree in representing Moses as a

[1] Bossuet, Discourses on Universal History, Part 2, ch. 3.

man of great virtue, perfect integrity, and irreproachably impartial. His integrity always inspired the most absolute confidence, so much so that his book became the rule of life for the Jewish people.

b. His writings bear the imprint of the most perfect sincerity and integrity; his style itself shows the tranquil loyalty of a writer who has no reason to fear contradiction: it is simple, unpretentious, free from exaggeration, enthusiasm, and flattery. Nowhere does the author disguise the faults of his ancestors or the evil inclinations of his people, his own weakness, and the chastisements which followed both. It is everywhere apparent that his object is only to record and preserve the memory of events known to his contemporaries as well as to him.

3d. Moses *could not deceive.*

a. The events which Moses relates, and of which he was the author or witness, are striking public events of the highest importance; upon them are founded the political and religious legislation of his nation, and the authority which he claimed for himself. He records the events, not in a vague, general way, but with every detail of circumstance, place, and person. "Forget not," he tells them, "the words that thy eyes have seen." "Thy eyes have seen the great things which thy God has done for thee." (Deut. iv., viii., xi.) If these alleged facts were false, would the Jews, always so ready to murmur against their liberator, have made no protest, particularly when the writer imposed upon them, in the name of God, duties very painful to their carnal nature? The very feasts of the Jews, religious and civil, such as the Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles; the ceremonies in use among them, like those of redeeming the first-born; their sacred canticles, which go back to the time of Moses, attest the continuance of the marvels which marked the departure from Egypt, the publication of the Law on Mt. Sinai, the sojourn in the desert, and all the great miracles worked in their favor through the ministry of Moses himself.

b. The events of which he was neither the author nor witness must have been fresh in the minds of the entire people. There is nothing comparable to the care and fidelity with which the Orientals preserve and transmit the reports of important events connected with their ancestors. It would have been impossible for Moses to add to or take from these popular traditions without offending the most cherished sentiments of the people and exciting the most violent protests.

ART. II.—THE PENTATEUCH AND THE SCIENCES.[1]

"Science," says Joseph de Maistre, "is a species of acid which dissolves all metals but gold." Only that which is divine resists the attacks of modern criticism. Christianity certainly has not lacked assailants, and if it has stood undaunted, without losing one of the dogmas it professes or one of the facts it guarantees, it is because it is of Heaven, as it claims and proves. The sciences, in our century particularly, have been brought under contribution to overthrow the rock upon which it rests, but so far from suffering injury thereby, the profound studies to which scholars have devoted themselves with noble ardor only confirm the authenticity of the Mosaic relation. Not infrequently, it is true, scientific discoveries have seemed, at first, to contradict the veracity of the sacred text; but when the arduous labors of the pioneers of science have led them deeper, and finally revealed undeniable truths, these alleged contradictions have vanished, and the truth of the sacred writings shines with greater brilliancy than ever.

To us who are Catholics this result is not astonishing. We know with absolute certainty that *no conflict is possible between faith and science.* The reason of this is simple: it is the

[1] On the various subjects of this article see Reusch, Schanz, I., Molloy, Thein, Vahey; also Wiseman, Science and Rev. Religion; Zahm, Science, Bible, and Faith; Gmeiner, Scientific Views.

same God, it is the Creator of all things who is at the same time the Lord of science and the Author of revelation. Whatever the means by which He communicates to us a portion of the truth, whether He reveals it directly to man, or discovers it gradually to the laborious investigations of scholars, God cannot contradict Himself, hence true science can never contradict revelation.[1]

But we cannot be satisfied with this summary affirmation. Particularly as alleged objections furnished by geology, paleontology, and other sciences[2] of which we hear so much, have not only proved a stumbling-block to many in their search for religious truth, but have wrecked the faith and caused the spiritual ruin of souls. The religious convictions of many have been overthrown by the oft-repeated assertions that science is incompatible with revelation; that modern discoveries evince the impossibility of miracles, and prove the absurdity of Christian dogmas. It is important that Catholic youth be able to show the inanity of these lying affirmations; they must be able to refute specious objections, and thus take from many of their brethren obstacles to the attainment of that truth which was revealed for the salvation of souls. For this reason we shall review the principal objections raised in the name of science against the Mosaic narration, on the subject of the age of the world, of the work of the six days, of the antiquity of man, etc. But a few general remarks are necessary first; they will serve to fix the reciprocal position of Holy Scripture and science.

First Remark.—*Holy Scripture is in no way a scientific*

[1] Cf. references on p. 38.

[2] Among the sciences usually called modern because of the great progress they have made in our centuries, we refer particularly to geology, or the science of the earth; astronomy, or the science of the heavens; biology, or the science of life; paleontology, or the science of fossils; anthropology, the object of which is the origin of man, his constitution, the unity of his species, and his antiquity; ethnology, or the science of peoples, that is, their antiquity, their tongues or idioms, their morals, customs, writings and monuments.

book.[1]—Even when it touches upon phenomena, the proper subject of science, its end is not to solve problems of geology or astronomy, but to teach us the truths of faith and to set forth the facts of religion. Thus when Moses relates the creation, he proposes to reveal and affirm the dogma and the fact of divine creation in regard to all categories of beings; to establish in this way the foundations of natural religion and the obligation of observing the Sabbath. His object is by no means to teach natural history, to formulate a theoretic and complete geogony, to describe scientifically the successive formations of the globe which we inhabit. Hence when we interpret Scripture it must be in this *doctrinal* and *religious* sense, and not for the purpose of seeking formulas to solve the disputed questions of scientists.

Second Remark.—Nevertheless, though the intention of the Spirit of truth was not to teach profane science, yet He could not have inspired what is false even upon a subject foreign to dogma and morality, nor have permitted the Sacred Scripture to set forth anything of the kind. Scripture, therefore, cannot present as true things which science proves to be false.

But if the sacred writer is never deceived in regard to the precise object of his statement, there is nothing to prevent his using expressions, metaphors, figures scientifically inaccurate, strictly speaking, but conformable to the genius of the language in which he expresses himself, or to the habit of mind of the people whom he addresses. A few examples will explain our thought.

When Josue wrote that, owing to the miraculous lengthening of the day (due perhaps to a local and atmospheric modification), he was able to achieve the battle of Gabaon, he related a certain fact. But to state this fact, and to be understood by the people, he used a popular term which expressed very clearly what he wished understood: he said that the sun stood still. This is the language of appearances.

[1] Reusch, ch. 3.

In this respect, moreover, the example of Josue is still followed by the greatest scholars and even by the Bureau of Longitudes. Notwithstanding the progress of astronomy, we still say that the sun rises and sets; and we should make ourselves ridiculous if, adopting strictly astronomical language, we were to say, the earth sets, the earth will rise to-morrow. It matters little, moreover, whether Josue was or was not ignorant of the scientific truth of this fact. The illustrious astronomer Kepler, referring to these words of Josue, says: "The Scripture in teaching sublime truths makes use of ordinary locutions in order to be understood. It speaks of natural phenomena only incidentally, and in terms common and familiar to men. We astronomers, ourselves, while perfecting astronomical science do not perfect language; we say with the people, the planets stop, the planets return; the sun rises, the sun sets, it rises in the heavens; like the people we express what appears to pass before our eyes, though in reality it is not true. We have less reason to require that Holy Scripture abandon, in this respect, ordinary for scientific language which would perplex the simple faithful and fail to attain the sublime end it proposes." Another famous astronomer, Arago, speaks in the same terms.

Another example. Moses speaks of the sun and moon as two great luminaries destined to light the earth, and he insists less upon the innumerable multitude of stars. The reason of this is that he does not pretend to give an astronomical classification; he expresses himself according to popular ideas; he speaks of nature as the people apprehended it and according to the relative importance of the stars to inhabitants of the earth. Again, when he enumerates the various animals he is not anxious to give a complete scientific enumeration, he is satisfied to make it understood that all were created by God.[1]

[1] It will be well to say a few words here in regard to a biblical fact, the history of Jonas, which has excited the ridicule of certain

THIRD REMARK.—Scientists have no reason to complain of being hampered by Catholic theology in their scientific studies, and particularly in their researches in regard to the formation of the globe. So far from barring the path of science, the Church leaves it full liberty to move and progress in the vast domain which God has abandoned to it. She applauds its efforts, certain in advance that its discoveries will only confirm revealed truths. Thus, the scholar possessed of faith finds himself as much at ease in his geological studies, for example, as the scholar who has not the happiness to believe.

Only recently has Leo XIII. proclaimed that "the Church does not forbid scientific labors, each science in its own sphere making use of the principles and methods proper to it," and he affirms that there is no conflict to fear, provided they remain within their own limits without invading the province of philosophy and of faith.[1] "Religion," said Bishop Freppel at the last session of the Scientific Congress

men of the present day as it did that of the pagans of Africa who were answered by St. Augustine. The fact is evidently miraculous, for the prophet could not naturally live three days in this dark prison and be cast forth whole and sound on the shore; but are we to regard the swallowing of Jonas by the whale as still another miracle? Yes, if the monster which devoured him was really a whale; as a matter of fact the œsophagus or gullet of this mammifer is too narrow to permit a man to pass. But the Hebrew, which is the original text, does not define the monster in question. It merely says it was a great fish—a term which, in its vulgar acceptation, includes all sea-monsters without exception, the cetacea as well as the fish properly so called. The word employed by the Septuagint version is not more precise. This is the opinion of the best commentators, Jews, Protestants, and Catholics. It seems preferable to suppose it a fish of the genus Pristis, as represented in the frescoes of the catacombs and the monuments of the first ages, or, better still, of the genus Squalus, like the shark or lamia. These fish have always inhabited the Mediterranean, and there are some of them so enormous that they could easily swallow a man without crushing him, as, in fact, they have been known to do.

[1] C. W. xlvii. 225, xlviii. 145; Month, liv. 474; also references on pp. 38, 56, and 63.

in Paris, 1891, "does not mean in any manner whatever to restrain the normal and regular growth of human science any more than she claims to issue a doctrinal judgment upon the merit of an oratorical or literary work. It is hardly necessary to say that the Church has received no revelation from her divine Founder, whether on the properties of material bodies or upon the relations of distance and space existing between the stars. In other words, and I use them in their precise meaning, there is no revealed astronomy, nor medicine, nor chemistry, nor physics. These are all natural sciences, which by their proper and specific subject build up their own temples and to whom theology can lend neither the laws of their operations nor the method of their development." And in fact these conflicts can only arise on the side of false science, that quasi-science which, going beyond its province and abandoning the method proper to it, endeavors to overthrow the truths of religion in the name of arbitrary hypotheses unverified by facts and experience. But this alleged science becomes anti-religious only when it ceases to be serious and positive and consequently of authority. Certainly we do not forbid scholars to formulate imaginary hypotheses in order to attain, eventually, positive conclusions; we only forbid them to present such things as obstacles to revealed truth as long as they are only gratuitous hypotheses.

What, then, is the method proper to these sciences and from which they must not depart?

Here is the answer given to this question by M. Berthelot, whose efficiency is well known: "Positive science proceeds by establishing facts and by uniting them one to another by immediate relations. . . . The human mind verifies the facts by observation and by experience; it compares them and draws relations therefrom; that is, more general facts, which are in their turn (and this is their only guarantee of reality) verified by observation and by experience. It is the chain of relations which constitutes positive science." This is the language of the most reliable scholars. They are equally

unanimous in regard to the object of these sciences, and to the province to which they must confine themselves. The same M. Berthelot proclaims that they have not to occupy themselves "either with first causes or the end of things." "Experimental science," says M. Pasteur in his turn, "is essentially positive in this sense, that in its conceptions the consideration of the essence of things, of the origin of the world and its destinies, never enters." The illustrious Claude Bernard also declares that the essence of things must remain unknown in positive science. Certainly this spiritual-minded savant did not repudiate metaphysics; he only protested against mixing methods. There is no one, not even Littré himself, who does not recognize that "experience has no value in questions of essence and of origin." Such is the language held by all in pursuit of science that is true and serious and not a matter of fancy and imagination. As long as the natural sciences are faithful to this method of observation, of experience, of induction, the only method by which they can attain certainty, as long as they keep within their proper province, they may boldly pursue their investigations and redouble their efforts: never will they encounter hindrance of any kind from theology.

Fourth Remark.—Moreover, the biblical affirmations in regard to facts concerning science, and for which the Church exacts respect, are *very few in number*. The reason is simple and follows from what we have just said: the Bible being a religious and not a scientific book, whenever it touches upon the phenomena of nature it is only to teach men whatever relates, in this matter, to their faith and conduct. By taking successively the principal objections formulated against the Mosaic narration, it would be an easy matter to show that these rare truths are in no way contradicted by the certain conclusions of modern sciences.

Fifth Remark.—Let us add another very important remark. In order that there be, on a point touching nature, any opposition between the Bible and science, the union of

three conditions is necessary. 1st. The exact and natural meaning of the Scripture must be *absolutely certain*, either because this meaning is completely self-evident or because it is fixed by the infallible authority of the Church. 2d. The affirmation of science must be *incontestable* and admitted by all judges of undisputed authority. 3d. There must be, finally, *absolute incompatibility* between the certain sense of the Bible and the result obtained and perfectly demonstrated by science. Now, these three conditions have never been encountered together and never can be.

First Condition.—Apart from the small number of truths clearly affirmed by the authority of the Church, it is difficult to fix in a certain manner the *literal* sense of the Bible in these kinds of passages. We speak particularly of the narration of the creation made by Moses in the first chapters of Genesis, for it is here particularly that objections arise. It is well known that this exposition of the work of creation, of the formation of our earth, has received on the part of the Fathers of the Church and of exegetes, the most varied, not to say the most opposite interpretations. Now it is a fundamental principle in hermeneutics that, in things left by God and by the Church to free discussion, each one must guard against giving his private interpretation as the absolute word of the Bible.

It is beyond all doubt that full certainty accompanies the interpretations of Scripture texts sustained by the unanimity—at least moral unanimity—of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church; provided, however, it is a doctrinal text, that is, contains doctrinal or moral teaching, and that the Fathers give their interpretation as being that of the Church and imposing, consequently, faith upon the faithful: " In matters of faith and morals belonging to the edification of Christian Doctrine," say the Councils of Trent and the Vatican. Then, and then only, are the Fathers and Doctors of the Church invested with higher authority, because in cases of this kind their teaching represents or manifests the

authentic teaching of the universal Church, which in virtue of the promise of her divine Founder is infallible. Outside such cases we are in no way bound by the *scientific* ideas of the ancient Fathers. In their exegetical labors they accepted the sciences as they were apprehended in their time; we are as free as they to avail ourselves, in explaining the Scripture, of the progress which these sciences have made in our day. The condition which we have just specified cannot be verified relative to the Mosaic account of the creation.

Second Condition.—For a conflict to be possible it is also necessary that the *scientific* affirmation be absolutely incontestable. Now in the majority of sciences pitted against the Bible this certainty can rarely be claimed.[1] To convince ourselves of this we have only to consider the number and variety of systems which have successively claimed preeminence, pronouncing all others absurd.

Geology and paleontology, particularly, should beware of establishing as axioms deductions still doubtful, of proclaiming as certain theories simply possible, hypotheses still unverified and unsupported by absolutely certain proofs. No doubt these sciences have made remarkable progress in modern times, and we are agreed, for example, in regard to the grand divisions of the strata of the earth, of the chronological classification of certain groups of fossils. But, again, the apologist, upon these capital and well-established points, has no difficulty in showing that the Bible in no way contradicts scientific data. In regard to certain details of science, concerning which we are far from certain, we may and should, before taking the trouble to examine them from a theological point of view, wait until scientists cease to contradict one another. This prudent delay is all the more necessary that it is well known that in geology, particularly, theories change with a rapidity which has become proverbial. Hypotheses only succeed hypotheses. And yet in virtue of each one of them it is claimed that the Bible errs! The Abbé

[1] Gerard, Science or Romance· J. L. Spalding, lect. 2.

Moigno, in his second volume of *Splendeurs de la Foi*, has inserted five large pages of assertions, all alleged to be scientific, giving concisely the objection and answer, the yea and the nay of a multitude of points.

Third Condition.—After what we have just said it is useless to insist upon the third condition required to make conflict possible. It is too evident. If the sense of the biblical text is certain, if the scientific fact is incontestable, there must be further, to prove the existence of any contradiction, absolute incompatibility between one and the other. This, as we have already said, never happens. Now to prove it.

I. The Bible and Geology.[1]

Thesis. Geology does not Contradict the Biblical Account of the Origin and Formation of the Universe of the Earth.

Geology is a science which explains the primitive formation of the earth and the successive changes which it has undergone up to the present day. It describes the structure of our globe, the different strata and mineral veins which form its crust, in a word, gives the anatomy of its immense frame.

Observation.—It is necessary to distinguish carefully the question of the *origin* of the world from that of its *formation*. The first is concerned only with the moment when the universe sprang out of nothing, the act by which it passed from non-existence into being; the second relates to the primitive transformations or evolutions of this primary matter, of the atomic elements, from the moment when the physical and chemical causes began to act.

A. Origin of the Universe.—Relative to the question of *origin* there is no reason to fear opposition between faith and science. And yet the Scripture speaks in the most categoric manner on the subject. "In the beginning God

[1] Schanz, I.; Reusch; Molloy; Vahey; Vuibert; Thein, Anthrop. ch. 9, Bible and Rat., p. IV.

created heaven and earth." It is God, it tells us, who created *all things*, primary matter and the laws which govern its successive transformations. But true science, that which keeps within its proper sphere, relying, as it should, solely on observation and experience, declares, as we have just seen, that it can teach us nothing in regard to primary causes, to the origin of the world.

B. PRIMARY FORMATION OF THE UNIVERSE.—Though the question of the origin of the world is absolutely beyond the sphere of the natural sciences, yet that of the primary transformations which it has undergone rightly belongs to them. Nor is there any fear that in this, their legitimate province, they will be hampered by theology, which is in no *way concerned* with the question. Moses in fact presents no cosmogony, properly speaking; he gives no theory as to the formation of the world. But whether the universe was created in its perfection or whether it gradually developed under the action of forces created by God; whether it began in a solid or a gaseous state; whether it underwent great cataclysms before reaching the state in which it was found at the appearance of man; whether it possessed in this primitive period a primary creation of organized beings, the necessity of a Creator is no less certain. Primary matter, the forces which animate it, the laws which govern its transformation, evidently claim a powerful and intelligent cause, the action of God. Faith in creation, therefore, is safe amid all these theories, and since Scripture is silent upon the other points, a vast field is opened to the investigations of science where it can proceed untrammelled.

It will be well to give here a sketch of the two most popular systems explaining the primary formation of the earth.

FIRST SYSTEM.—The theory in regard to the formation of the universe generally received among scholars is that imagined, it is said, by Kant, adopted by Herschel, and finally clearly formulated by Laplace. Several modern discoveries have added a new degree of probability to this

magnificent hypothesis. We know that the spectroscope, for example, made it possible to prove that the chemical composition of all the heavenly bodies is fundamentally the same as that of our globe. This system considers the earth as a nebula changed from the state of gas to that of a solid, that is, as a gaseous mass of enormous volume, which, gradually condensing, became a fluid incandescent mass. Substances in a state of gas being much larger in volume than when in a solid form, our planet had, at first, immense dimensions.[1] But, cooling continually during innumerable centuries, the planet, at first vaporous, reached a fluid and incandescent state, diminished in volume, and assumed, like all bodies in rotation about an axis, a spherical form flattened toward the poles. The cooling, continuing, produced a solid crust which gradually thickened until it reached a depth of about ten leagues, which is the depth attributed to the earth's crust at the present day. Minerals were formed at the same time in the mass. The earth's radius being 1584 leagues, its crust can be only a sort of bark; its interior is still, as in the beginning, in a state of fusion.

While this gradual cooling was going on, materials in a state of ebullition, striking violently against the thin crust of the earth, dislocated it in various parts, swelled it, pierced through it, and thus produced the mountains. At other times, in filling the fissures and crevices already produced, they formed the mineral veins which we are now exploring.

At the same time there reigned about the earth an atmosphere charged with vapors, and with mineral and earthy materials, constantly kept at a high temperature by the heat of the mass in fusion. The temperature of this mass lowering according as the solidity of the crust increased, there were produced, by condensation, immense quantities

[1] What is here said of our globe must also be applied to the sun and to our whole planetary system, which was originally one confused, gaseous mass.

of water which fell upon the surface of the earth. Meanwhile the heat of the superficial crust reduced them anew to the state of vapors falling back into a liquid state. The waters, however, coming into repeated contact with the surface of the earth, decomposed it and formed insensibly materials which they carried to the valleys and deposited in successive strata. Finally, after a long struggle between the liquid and the solid element, the waters ended by localizing and formed what we call the seas. The present volcanic eruptions appear to be only feeble remnants of these interior convulsions, which in the first ages must have been much more violent and more general. This theory gives heat, as we see, a preponderating influence in the formation of the rocks.

Second System.—According to this system, a sort of watery liquid must have primitively contained in solution the elements of mineral substances. By pressure and chemical combinations, all these materials passed into a solid state, settling into crystalline forms and the various kinds of rocks. This theory also contains a very specious explanation of earthquakes, thermal waters, volcanic phenomena, and other mysteries of nature. It has been called the *chemical* theory in opposition to the first, which is called the *physical*. Though it is less accredited by scholars than its rival, it does not lack illustrious defenders.

These two scientific systems are divided into several others, and there are scholars who combine them both. What are we to think of these systems? We are free, as we have already said, to adopt whichever seems to us most probable. Moses, it is true, says that there was a time when what is now called the earth "was void and empty" (in the Septuagint "unsightly and shapeless"), and that "darkness was upon the face of the deep"; but this fact is acknowledged, without exception, by all geologists. They are agreed as to an azoic period destitute of all animate substance.

Remark upon the Age of the World.—We do not speak

here of the age of man, that is, of the period which has elapsed since mankind appeared upon the earth. We shall take up this question later on. The age of the world is the period comprised between the moment when God began to create beings out of nothing and the present moment. It is composed consequently, 1st, of an interval which may have existed between the first moment of creation and the work of the six days, properly so called; 2d, of the time which this work itself lasted; 3d, of the years which have elapsed since that period and the present time. We see at once that it is impossible to deduce the age of the universe from the sacred text, since between the first creation of the elements of matter and the *organization* of these elements there may have elapsed an absolutely unknown period of time. The question seems more insolvable still when we study that of the six days, or the Hexahemeron.

C. The Work of the Six Days, or the Hexahemeron.[1]—After speaking, in the first verse of Genesis, of the general creation of primitive matter, and specifying the chaotic state of the earth in particular, the sacred historian relates the ulterior organization of the earth, destined to be the abode of an intelligent and free creature. He divides this organization into six acts or periods which he calls days, with evening and morning. Here is a summary of the Mosaic Hexahemeron: The first day God caused light to spring from the bosom of the darkness which enveloped the earth. The second day He established the firmament in the midst of the waters by separating the waters above from the waters below the firmament, and He called the firmament heaven. The third day He gathered into one place the waters under the firmament, which He called seas, and caused the dry land to appear, which He called the earth; the same day He commanded the earth to bring forth the green herbs which bear seed, and fruit-trees which yield fruit, each according to its kind, each

[1] C. W. xxiv. 490, xl. 145, xliv. 317, 351, 445; D. R. III. Ser. v. 311, vi. 49; M. xli.

having seed according to its kind. The fourth day He caused the sun to shine in the firmament, to rule the day; and the moon, to rule the night; and the stars. The fifth day He commanded the waters to bring forth creeping creatures having life, and fowl that fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven. The sixth day He commanded the earth to bring forth the living creatures in its kind, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth according to their kinds. Finally, the same day He made man to His image and likeness, and the seventh day He rested, that is, He ceased to create.[1] If we confine ourselves simply to reading the beginning of Genesis, it would seem as though Moses had clearly indicated a *chronological* order in the formation of our globe and of what it contains. Yet how variously the Fathers and theologians interpret this work of the six days! While a great number of them admit the *successive* order of creation, the Alexandrian school, particularly Clement and Origen, think that the historian had no intention whatever of establishing this succession of days or epochs. They believe, on the contrary, that God created everything *at once;* only Scripture, they say, in order to accommodate itself to human intelligence, distinguishes and states separately the various works really accomplished in one indivisible instant. Hence they find in the Mosaic relation no *chronologic-historic* exposition, but simply a *logical* interpretation of the creative activity. St. Augustine also admits that everything was created at once. In his opinion the days of creation are only the various logical

[1] Must this rest of the seventh day or the cessation of the creating act be considered as extending universally to all beings or only to our earth? In the first place, this repose even in regard to our earth is not absolute: each day God creates a great number of souls to unite them to bodies. And there is no reason why other worlds may not spring again out of nothing at the creating word; and our planet even give place one day to another when the destiny of man will be accomplished. It was for our moral and religious instruction that Moses wrote, and not to satisfy our curiosity relative to points foreign to the end he had in view.

moments of *knowledge* which the angels had of the works of God. As to St. Thomas Aquinas, he first remarks in his general principles that when a text is susceptible of two meanings, both conformable to Catholic doctrine, we should not arbitrarily exclude one, and claim that the other is the only meaning of the Holy Spirit. Afterward applying this rule to the present question, he carefully distinguishes the creation itself from the order of the works of creation. Though he proclaims with all the Fathers that the *creation* is a dogma of faith, yet he ranges the question of *order* in the class of free opinions. The opinion which affirms the *chronologic order* seems to him, it is true, more simple and, at first sight, more conformable to the letter of the text; yet he finds the explanation of St. Augustine *more rational, more ingenious, more efficacious* in defending the Holy Scriptures against scoffers: and he adds that he prefers the first.

Such authorities give us great freedom in interpreting the work of the six days. Nothing obliges us to seek concordance between the inspired text and scientific discoveries. Hence but few of the objections raised in the name of profane science against the Hexahemeron can be sustained.[1]

Does this mean that the partisans of the chronologic-historic interpretation are wrong when they endeavor to establish a *positive concordance* between the biblical narrative and the results acquired by science? By no means. They also are free to maintain their opinion, which has numerous and illustrious supporters. They can do so all the more that they believe it possible to show that the narrative of the creation is, in its great outlines, in perfect harmony with the discoveries of contemporaneous science; that this narrative contains the culminating facts of cosmogony, and, what is more remarkable still, that it presents them in the very order indicated by scholars.

Here is how a learned contemporary, M. Pfaff, expresses

[1] Zahm, Bible, Science, etc., p. I. ch. 4; Schanz, I., ch. 15.

himself on the subject of this concordance in his *Histoire de la création:*

"If we compare scientific data with the biblical history of creation, we find that the latter agrees with these data as far as we have any right to expect. We discover, in fact, the same reigns, equally distinct in themselves: allowing for the historic variations which they may have undergone, the chronological sequence of their appearance is exactly given by Moses. The primitive chaos; the earth covered first by the waters, then emerging from them; the formation of the inorganic reign, followed by the vegetable reign; then of the animal reign, of which the first representatives were the animals living in the waters, and after them the animals of the land; man appearing, finally, the last of all: this is indeed the true succession of creatures; such, in fact, are the various periods of the history of creation, periods designated under the names of days."

This word *day* used by Moses, in the first verses of Genesis, claims a special explanation in the system of those who hold to the chronologic-historic sense. What are we to understand by these days in which God organized primitive matter and drew from it the creatures which constitute the entire creation? We have great freedom in this interpretation. In fact:

1st. The Hebrew word which we translate day is used in that language, as in our own, metaphorically, in the sense of time, period; the Scripture itself in several places, and in the very chapter of which we are speaking, employs this word to designate periods, and not days properly speaking. There is nothing in this interpretation surprising to us who constantly say, in the day of adversity, in the happy days of my youth, etc.

2d. The Fathers of the Church and theologians give various explanations of this word, as well as of the terms evening and morning, and the Church, on her part, has defined nothing concerning them.

3d. St. Augustine even causes us to observe that the first three days cannot be astronomical days, since there was neither rising nor setting of sun: it is only on the fourth day that the sun and moon appear and rule the day and the night.

It is evident that we are perfectly justified in understanding by the word *days* undetermined periods of time of greater or less duration, of thousands or of millions of years, but finite, having a beginning and an end.

"As to the words *evening* and *morning* which Moses employs, they have, even in Scripture," says P. Ollivier, "a double literal sense which agrees perfectly with the system of day-periods. They signify, first, end and beginning, or accomplishment and inception; and thus the Mosaic formula means that the accomplishment of each of the works of the six days, developed gradually from its inception, marked a distinct period of geogony. They signify afterward confusion and arrangement; and in this sense, which is perhaps the more acceptable, the same formula may be translated thus: From the first state of confusion and of its arrangement was formed the first period, . . . the second period, etc. This interpretation seems to find support in the omission of the word *ereb*, evening, before the description of the *yom*, or seventh day, which is the day of rest. This day is certainly not a day of twenty-four hours: it is a period which still endures and which was not begun in a state of confusion."

What we have said may serve to solve several other special difficulties. It will be well, however, to continue to mention, in going over the sciences, the principal objections which may be alleged against the Mosaic narration, and to demonstrate briefly how little faith has to fear from them.

D. The Mosaic Deluge.[1]—Here are the terms in which Moses relates this great event. In the six hundredth year of the life of Noe, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, all the fountains of the great deep were

[1] Cf. also M. lxii. 335 ff.; C. W. xl. 635. xliv. 741, xlix. 17.

broken up, and the floodgates of heaven were opened: and the rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights. . . . And the waters prevailed beyond measure upon the earth: and all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it covered. And all flesh was destroyed that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of all creeping things that creep upon the earth: and all men, and all things wherein there is the breath of life on the earth, died. And He destroyed all the substance that was upon the earth, from man even to beast, and the creeping things and fowls of the air: and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noe only remained, and they that were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days. (Gen. ch. vii.)

Let us remark, first, that geology, in its present state, presents no proof either for or against the deluge. This is not astonishing; the inundation, being only a passing event, left the surface of the earth almost intact: the vegetable reign was not disturbed, the olive-tree reappeared in all its freshness as soon as the waters subsided, and the animals on coming out of the ark found their usual food. The deposits called *diluvium*, as well as the *erratic* boulders or rocks formerly attributed to the Mosaic deluge, are of another source.

But if geology is silent, history speaks clearly. The fact of the Mosaic deluge is so undeniable that to doubt it is to reject all historic certainty.

1st. The account which Moses gives of this great catastrophe in which the whole human race, with the exception of Noe and his family, perished, is clear, accurate, and methodical. The details are given in such a circumstantial, united, coordinate manner as to form a sort of journal or historic record, properly speaking. Now all are agreed, and we have demonstrated, that Moses (aside from being inspired, a fact which we do not consider in all this part of our labor) is a profoundly learned and eminently reliable author; there is

nothing in his writings to justify the least suspicion of levity or fraud.

2d. His account of the deluge, moreover, was admitted without a shadow of reluctance by the Hebrews, his compatriots, who would undoubtedly have protested if this marvellous event had not been recognized as incontestable. A great number of the biblical writers who followed were faithful echoes of Moses, and Jesus Christ Himself, as well as the apostles, confirmed his testimony in formal terms. Profane historians, those of the Jewish nation, like Josephus and Philo, as well as those of other nations, are no less explicit.

3d. We find the same unanimity in the traditions or chronicles of all the *white races:* always a mass of water in which everything is swallowed up, a single couple saved by taking refuge in a ship, a mountain upon which this ship rested, a bird sent out at the end of the catastrophe, and even a rainbow. And, what is no less striking, all or nearly all these traditions locate this event about the same period. [1]

4th. Let us add that the event is so well established that even unbelievers, like Bailly, Fréret, Boulanger, are forced to yield to the truth of conviction. Hear what the latter says: "Let us take, in the traditions of men, a fact the truth of which is universally recognized. What is this fact? I know of no event whose monuments are attested more generally than the monuments which have been transmitted to us by that famous physical revolution which, it is said, formerly changed the face of our globe, and occasioned a renewal of human society. In a word, the deluge seems to me the real epoch in the history of nations. Not only is the tradition which transmits it the most ancient, but it is also clear and intelligent, it presents to us a fact which can be justified and confirmed by universal suffrage, since the tradition of it is found in all languages and in all countries of the world." "Not only the

[1] Lord Arundel Tradition, ch. 10 ff.

Aryan and the Semitic races," says Renan, " but nearly all peoples head their annals with a struggle against a humid element, represented by a great cataclysm." The fact of the deluge, therefore, is incontestable. Hence none of the objections formulated against it have any real value. Moreover, we must bear in mind that it is an event miraculous in its cause, in its announcement, and in its agent: it was God who used the deluge to punish a guilty human race; it was He who, a hundred years in advance, uttered His prophetic menaces; it was He who at the same time opened the abyss of the earth and the floodgates of heaven. Now nothing is impossible to the Almighty. Hence, though science may be unable to answer the questions which arise concerning the *manner* of this great catastrophe, it argues nothing against the *reality* of the catastrophe itself.

But is it true that science casts no light upon this subject? Far from it. First it is necessary to remark that the principal objections raised by Carl Vogt and other scholars against this cataclysm vanish of themselves the moment we assume that the Mosaic deluge did not cover all the *habitable* earth. Now nothing obliges us to believe that the entire globe was submerged by the diluvian waters. It is true that Moses, to mark the extent of the disaster, uses at one time the expression " all the earth," and at another an expression equivalent to it, " under the whole heaven," *universa terra, sub universa caelo;* but these expressions do not imply absolute universality; in fact, in many parts of the Scriptures they evidently apply to only a part of the earth. Thus a number of theologians, following the opinion already proclaimed at the end of the seventeenth century by the scientist Isaac Vossius, interpret the words of Moses in the sense of a deluge which covered only all the then inhabited portion of the globe, destroying the human race, with the exception of eight persons shut up in the ark. We know, moreover, that not all the countries of the universe were inhabited by men. Moses, adopting the current language of his time, and wishing

to be understood by those to whom he spoke, naturally meant to convey by the expression "under the whole heaven" the celestial space which covered the countries inhabited by Noe and his compatriots, that is, a part of Asia.

This explanation of the sacred text, largely accepted by exegetists, is in no way condemned by the Church; never has it been defined a dogma of faith that the diluvian waters submerged even the uninhabited parts of the globe. In adopting this interpretation we destroy the very foundation of the objections current relative to the deluge. "Discussions concerning the history of the deluge," says M. Pfaff, "are now without object for the naturalist, since theologians recognize that we may receive the account of Genesis as signifying, not that all the mountains on the globe were simultaneously inundated, but that all humanity was destroyed by a powerful volume of water. This is granting that the deluge was a partial submersion of the globe. The scientist has no opposition to offer to the fact of the deluge thus explained: it is impossible for him to prove that a partial deluge, the existence of which is, moreover, affirmed by the traditions of nearly all nations, may not have taken place or has not really taken place."

There is an opinion more recent still according to which the deluge may not have extended universally to all men. This opinion has been defended and attacked in various learned publications. Let us content ourselves with reporting the judgment of a competent authority like the Abbé Vigouroux. "We reject," he says, "this interpretation because it is contrary to the general tradition of the Church, and nothing demonstrates that this tradition is an erroneous interpretation of the sacred text."

Let us add a few subsidiary remarks.

1st. There is nothing in regard to the construction of the ark which need greatly surprise us. Why could not Noe, who was rich enough to engage a sufficient number of strong, intelligent workmen, and who had a hundred years in which to

accomplish his work, execute the order of God at a time when the arts and sciences were well advanced, when they built great cities, when they raised those monuments of Baalbak, the ancient Heliopolis of Syria, the great ruins of which still tax the imagination of modern times? We refer to the most ancient part of these ruins, for there is another part which does not go farther back than the Antonines. "While the great stones of the pyramids," says Lamartine in his *Voyage en Orient*, "do not exceed 18 feet in length, the hewn blocks of granite of Baalbak, which form the basis of the temples, are 156 feet long, from 15 to 16 feet wide, and of unknown thickness; and these enormous masses were taken from distant quarries, then hoisted one above another at a distance of 20 or 30 feet above the ground. Hence it is believed," adds the same author, "that these gigantic stones were moved either by men whom all primitive histories call giants, or by antediluvian men." Burckhard, who measured a few of these blocks, found the largest was 55.50 metres in length 3.65 metres in width and of equal thickness.

Let us conclude that it was not more difficult to construct the ark than to raise the stones of Baalbak: according to this evidence of strength and intelligence, the construction of the ark must have been mere play.

2d. In regard to the capacity of the ark, it has been proved by estimates made repeatedly by M. Le Pelletier, by the learned Abbé Maupied, by Silberschlag, the skilful architect of Berlin, and by the French Vice-Admiral Thévenard, that the ark could contain many more kinds of animals, mammals, birds, and reptiles than exist at present, as well as the food necessary for them.

Tiele has calculated that the capacity of the ark was 3,600,000 cubic feet, and that thus there was, reserving nine tenths for provisions, sufficient space to lodge very conveniently nearly 7000 kinds of animals, at the rate of one couple of each kind. This was evidently a larger number of species than was necessary, for, according to our supposition of a

partial deluge, Noe did not need to take more than a relatively limited number of animal species.

Men competent to judge have also shown that the ark, in a nautical point of view, was of the best possible proportions, so much so that it may be regarded as a veritable masterpiece.

3d. Other objections quite as untenable have been raised in the name of ethnology and philology. To explain how the descendants of Noe had time to form the various races of which we shall speak later, and which are stated to have existed as far back as we can go, and to explain also how human language can be as varied as it is at the present day, we need only observe that the *date* of the deluge is unknown to us. We shall prove, in speaking of the antiquity of peoples, that for the first ages of humanity there is, properly speaking, no biblical chronology, and that we do not know at what period the Mosaic deluge took place. We can maintain that this terrible chastisement was inflicted by God on the human race at a time much nearer that of Adam than is generally supposed. There is nothing to prevent its dating as far back as historic and archæologic sciences require.[1]

II. The Bible and Astronomy.

We shall confine ourselves to answering a few objections formulated in the name of astronomical science; they are directed specially against the work of the first and of the fourth day.[2]

First Objection.—Why are heavenly bodies, incomparably greater than the earth, represented as simple accessories of the latter, as luminaries in its service?

Answer.—1st. We have only to remember that Moses was not writing an astronomy and had no need to treat his work from the point of view of modern mechanism. Writing

[1] Thein, The Bible and Rat., p. iv. ch. 15; Anthropol., ch. 16.
[2] Schanz, I., ch. 16.

to instruct the inhabitants of the earth in their religious duties, he speaks of the heavens according as they appear to our senses and according to the relative influence of each star upon our planet. Do not all writers, with the exception of those whose object it is to give a precise exposition of science, speak, even at the present day, in absolutely similar terms? It is unimportant for us to know whether Moses received or did not receive from God precise ideas concerning the sun and the stars; what is certain is that, considering his object, he should not have spoken otherwise than he did.

2d. Our planet, moreover, while filling a very modest rôle in the astronomical system, has, because of its connection with the divine plan of the redemption, a much more striking one in the *religious* order. If it pleased God to choose the grain of sand which we call the earth upon which to place the king of creation, and above all to make it the theatre of revelation and of the Incarnation of the Word, why should not Moses speak of the earth in a very special manner? Jerusalem was very insignificant in comparison with the illustrious cities of antiquity, and yet Holy Scripture does not speak of the latter, or mentions them only in connection with the history of Jerusalem and of the Jewish people. Who could take offence at this?

And let us not say it is strange that God should specially choose a little globe like ours to make it the habitation of man and the theatre of the Incarnation. There is much which could be said in reply to this, but we shall content ourselves with a few beautiful reflections from a conference of P. Olivier, S.J. "The grotto of Bethlehem," he says, "was a very humble and obscure place for the birth of the Redeemer of the world; why then did God prefer it to a magnificent palace in some illustrious city? Let us not search into the secret designs of God: unless God Himself reveal them to us, our search will be vain. We may ask man the reason of his conduct, but with God we ask what is His good pleasure. His

will is the reason of all things, for it is ever just and holy, blending with His infinite wisdom. After all, immensity, in His sight, is no more than a grain of sand; and if He has chosen the grain of sand which we call the earth to place upon it the king of creation, it is because He has made this earth suitable to bear Him. Moreover, even though God in creating the worlds had no other object than to offer the mind of man an inexhaustible subject of study, and to the heart of man a touching motive of gratitude and love, who would dare to declare this end unworthy of Him whose power has no limits, and whose magnificence equals His power?

"After that, each one is free to prefer that there exist in other worlds free and intelligent creatures, composed like man of body and soul, of matter and spirit, and endowed like him, by the goodness of their author, with all the means of existence suitable to their nature and their end.

"At the same time we are not ill pleased to see in man alone the final cause of the visible creation, and, consequently, in the earth which bears him the most august place and, before God, the true centre of the universe. Has not God so loved man as to give him His only Son? And what are all the worlds compared to this divine gift? Has He not even made man divine, by associating his poor human nature with the divine nature in the person of the incarnate Word, and is not man, thus transfigured, greater than all the worlds that roll in space? If the Christ, first announced and prefigured, afterward appearing on the earth, and finally perpetuating Himself there in His work, which is His Church, and in His sacrament of love, which is the Eucharist, is truly the centre of the history of humanity, why should he not also be the centre of the history of worlds? And if this conclusion should not seem rash, do you think the starry firmament a dome too great and too magnificent for this earth destined to bear the Man-God? Certainly it is very beautiful to think of the heavens as peopled by beings who recognize and adore the Creator; is it less so to see in them satellites—may astronomy

pardon us the term!—stationed, like the Magi at Bethlehem, about the humble dwelling of their sovereign Master, bowing with respect before this earth so small and yet so great, honored by His presence and sanctified by His divine blood? Does not one drop of the blood of Jesus weighed in the balance of truth outweigh all the worlds ever created; and the sacrifice of the cross, and the sacrifice of our altars which renews and perpetuates it throughout the world, do they not suffice, were man the only intelligent creature after the angels, to justify all the magnificence of the universe?" [1]

Remark.—1st. Apropos of this objection, it is well to observe that never has either the Holy Scripture or the Catholic Church taught that the earth is the central point of the material world, or that it dwells motionless in space, while the sun and the stars revolve about it as about their centre of motion. As the earth was believed immovable by the Greek and Roman world, it was natural that this opinion should reappear among a large number of the Fathers of the Church. In this, as in many other things outside their immediate province, they followed the ideas universally received; but their error on this point has nothing common with faith. Hence it did not prevent Copernicus, a sincere believer and priest, from breaking down this false system. In any case, Scripture has nothing whatever to do with the geocentric error. It is content to affirm that the sun, moon, and stars serve to light and vivify the earth. Who can deny this fact as evident as the day?

2d. Let us add still another word on the hypothesis of the

[1] According to M. Faye, the earth is far from being of minimum importance in an astronomical point of view. This learned scholar says that, of the myriads of stars discovered by the telescope, not one is inhabited, and the reason that he gives for this, is that they are all in full incandescence; and he adds that none of them ever will be inhabited, because at the period of their extinction, when a living being could set foot on their cooled and solidified crust, there would be, owing to their immense distance one from another, no neighboring sun to impart to them light and heat.

plurality of inhabited worlds.[1] This hypothesis has been sustained with talent by several Catholic writers, particularly by Father Secchi, S. J.; but though there is nothing condemnatory in their opinion, it affords, according to our mind, no convincing proof. It is in no way repugnant to us to think that these innumerable stars which people the universe contain intelligent creatures capable of knowing God; we have no difficulty in admitting that, if these creatures really exist, they had no need of redemption, or that God manifested His mercy to them in a manner unknown to us, or that they shared in the effects of the blood of infinite price shed on Calvary. But we do not see why man may not be the final cause of all the visible creation, why God, to whom nothing is impossible, may not have created these great planets in innumerable multitudes to give man a greater idea of His almighty power, and also to detach him more easily from the contemptible things of earth.

Second Objection.—How was the earth produced before the sun, which is the centre of its orbit, the regulator of its movement, the principle of its fecundity, and, perhaps, its regenerating focus?

Answer.—This objection is absolutely without foundation, for it does not necessarily follow from the words of Genesis that the earth was *created* before the sun and stars. Commentators admit that these words: "God created heaven and earth," imply that the stars were created at the *same time* as the earth in its *chaotic* state; but that various causes—for example, the heavy vapors which primitively enveloped the earth—may have rendered the stars *invisible* to it; it would be only on the fourth day, in the fourth period, when these vapors disappeared, that the sun and moon would have begun, in their definite and complete form, *to shine upon our globe.* According to these exegetists, this is the sense in which we must understand the words of Genesis regarding

[1] Schanz, I., ch. 17; C. Q. R. ix. 193, 452; C. W. xxxvii. 49, lv. 860, lvi. 18.

the fourth day. There is no doubt that this sense is sufficiently justified by the establishment of visible and normal relations between these stars and our globe. We must observe, however, that Moses does not say, God then created the sun, moon, and stars, but, God made, that is, caused to appear. Whatever the truth of this explanation, the Church has not condemned it, consequently the most rigid exegetists may freely use it.

THIRD OBJECTION.—Does it seem probable that God took five days to organize our little globe when He needed but one to create all the worlds of sidereal space?

ANSWER.—Where do we read that God employed but one day for this last work? Moses, it is true, tells us in detail the manner in which God prepared the earth, the cradle of the human race; that is, he tells us what it most concerns us to know: he informs us at what moment the stars became useful luminaries to *the earth;* but he had not to make known to us how these stars were formed, or the time that this formation may have required. Moreover, this fourth day or fourth period may, like the others, include millions of years. Hence astronomers have a free field for their hypotheses; they have no need to fear contradiction from Scripture, which is silent on this point.

FOURTH OBJECTION.—We cannot admit, when the sun did not exist, (*a*) the existence of light; (*b*) of vegetation.

a. We can hardly understand how one could venture to propose such an objection. If it had any real value, we should have to conclude that it is impossible ever to have light at night. It is daily evident to the most ignorant that there exist sources of light other than the sun. The very light of the lamp by which Voltaire, perhaps, wrote this ridiculous objection ought to have shown him its absurdity. Who does not know that to render dark bodies luminous nothing more is required than a high temperature or an intense and rapid chemical combination? Will not electricity send forth brilliant sparks of light in the midst of intense darkness?

Certainly the combination of cosmic elements at the beginning of the world had sufficient power to produce a light in no way inferior to that of the sun. Let us observe that the mass of matter which we now call the sun has passed through two different states: it existed first in a nebulous state, endowed with a certain power of giving light, like other nebulæ still observed by astronomers; later, under the influence of numerous attractions, its constitution underwent an intimate change, and became that of the planet which we to-day behold. *In both of these states* this mass may have been the light of day to our globe; thus it is manifestly evident that light could have reached us before the sun had its definite form.

b. We are still less embarrassed by the objection concerning the existence of *vegetation* before the appearance of the sun under its present form, for this existence is completely established by geology. Hear the testimony of Hugh Miller on this subject: "At no other period [the coal period, before the influence of the sun, at least under the form which we now see] was there so magnificent a flora. For example, there were 2500 kinds of ferns (there are now only sixty in Europe), and they were of gigantic size. The trunk of the Calamus, a kind of reed, grew, probably in a few months, to 30 feet in diameter." This is the fact; we are not called upon to explain it. Let us remark, however, that electric light possesses all the qualities necessary for the accomplishment of phenomena essential to vegetation. It is the same with all kinds of light, natural and artificial. It is well known that the same gigantic vegetation has been found at the poles and at the equator: a high temperature united with uniform and constant humidity prevailed then over the whole earth. To explain this primitive condition we may have recourse to the scientific hypothesis we have mentioned. The sun under its nebulous form could send its light and diffuse its heat to the earth through the thick vaporous covering which enveloped it.[1]

[1] We shall examine the question of Galileo in the second part of this course, Ch. IV

III. The Bible and Biology.[1]

We have just seen that faith has nothing to fear from geology, or the science of the earth, nor from astronomy, or the science of the heavens. Let us prove that it is still more secure on the side of biology, or the science of life.

According to Scripture, God, by an act of His almighty power, created different kinds of plants and animals and gave them the faculty of reproduction. Impious naturalists attack this teaching in the name of what they call spontaneous generation. Spontaneous generation, according to them, consists in the formation of certain living creatures not only from preexisting germs, but solely from the influence of chemical and physical forces inherent in matter. Thus, according to their theory, a living being, whether plant or animal, can be brought into life without preexisting germs furnished by antecedent life, by the simple effect of physico-chemical reaction, "like sugar or vitriol." And they argue that if this can be done now, it could always be done, and that the hypothesis of creation from living organisms is at least superfluous. Such is the objection presented by the heterogenist materialists.

Answer.—Not only is the alleged fact of purely spontaneous generation, that is, without preexisting germs, unproved, but it is a hypothesis that is no longer even tenable, and it is rejected by the most competent authorities. "No one since Redi," says M. Flourens, "believes any longer in the spontaneous generation of insects; that of intestinal worms finds no defenders since Balbiani, and since the experiments of Pasteur, it has been generally abandoned in regard to every kind of animalculæ." "We consider the doctrine of spontaneous generation definitely condemned," says M. Quatrefages. "Not a single positive fact," says Virchow, "is

[1] See Mivart; Beale; Th. Hughes, S.J.; O'Neill; Quatrefages; Gerard; Thein, The Bible, etc., p. IV.; D. R., III. Ser. xiii. 332; A. C. Q. xix. 673, vi. 193, 542, xvii. 449; C. W. xliv. 654; Br. W. ix. 365,485, 495, xix. 673.

known to prove that there has ever been such a thing as spontaneous generation, or that inorganic matter has ever been spontaneously transformed into an organic being." No one, not even Darwin, despite his theories of transformation, accepts it; Littré himself, even before his conversion, though the hypothesis accorded then so well with his atheism, rejected it. But it is particularly important to hear the opinion of the best authority in the matter. Here is how M. Pasteur, one of the glories of the Academy of Sciences of Paris, terminated a lesson given at the Sorbonne, in the presence of the most eminent scientists: "There has never been a single known instance of beings coming into the world without parents. Those who affirm the contrary are victims of illusions or of causes which they could not appreciate or which they did not remove."[1] On another occasion he said: "I am convinced that, in the present state of science, spontaneous generation is a chimera. It is impossible to contradict me, for my experiments are all unrefuted, and all prove my assertion." After his memorable works, confirmed by the experiments of Schultze, Schwann, Milne-Edwards, and the observations of Payen, Quatrefages, and Dumas, the Academy of Sciences announced this fundamental law of biological science: "All organized beings, in the actual state of our globe, receive life from bodies already living; large and small are born of ancestry."

[1] Air apparently the most pure contains an infinite amount of vegetable and animal germs which easily pass through any filter or by any stopple. These germs, when placed in the proper medium, begin to develop and then cause the fermentation or decomposition of diverse substances. By shutting off, under the most minute precautions, all contact with such germs, Dr. Pasteur has been able to establish the fact that life never appears spontaneously in organic matter; that the most changeable liquids may be preserved intact for an indefinite time, provided that the ferments supplied by the air are kept out. It is well known that these discoveries of Pasteur have enabled modern surgery to make such wonderful progress by means of antiseptic treatment that it can confidently undertake surgical operations which until recently were considered impossible.

REMARKS.—1st. The hypothesis of spontaneous generation, even if proved true, would not accomplish the end desired by a *certain number* of its partisans. With it they would disprove the fact of creation and thereby the existence of God. But were we to admit that now and at the beginning of the world life sprang of itself from matter, there would still remain to be explained *the first appearance* of this matter and the properties we assign to it. It must have existed, it has not the power to produce itself; hence it must owe its existence to a being anterior and superior to it. We always have to return, whether we will or not, to a creating act, to the intervention of the divine almighty power.

2d. Science demonstrates, moreover, that life has not always existed upon the earth: that it had a beginning. It is equally certain that, up to the present day, no living creature was ever found that did not spring from another being endowed with life. This fact and this law, the existence of which is absolutely established, is a singular embarrassment to materialists: to sustain their absurd system of the eternity of matter they must not only repudiate a metaphysical proof accepted as irrefutable by the best authorities, but they must set aside the conclusions of science itself, that is, the testimony of observation and experiment. This is hard for men who affect to accept only such means of certainty and to place faith in nothing but science.

3d. Another remarkable thing is that the more science progresses, the nearer it approaches the Christian dogma. Virchow himself, to whom virtue and vice appeared only as chemical products like sugar and vitriol, and thought was nothing but a secretion of the brain, has at last been forced to write these significant words: "To attribute the production of life and of mind to a simple evolution of the organic world is to admit a pure hypothesis and to leave the grounds of science." He goes further still: "Inasmuch as the action of matter can no longer be considered as the last cause of the production of beings, ample room is left for a higher causality

which we have not the right to declare impossible. The question of theism stands out in all its greatness and power before us." Haeckel, one of the high-priests of the materialistic and godless science, has not the courage frankly to acknowledge the triumph of truth. Yet he confesses that "if we reject spontaneous generation, we must admit miracles."

4th. Scientists have not only proved that there was a time when no living being existed on earth, but they also tell us now that the day will come when all life shall disappear from our globe. Some venture even to indicate approximately the epoch of this extinction. It is a well-established fact that some of the stars which people the heavens are gradually losing their light and heat; that even our sun has considerably cooled, and that the time will come when it will no longer send enough heat upon this earth to sustain life. But this cooling process is not the only cause that, sooner or later, is to bring about the cessation of life here below. Scientific research has led to the discovery of several other causes of inevitable ruin. In discussing these causes scientists, very properly, simply move within the sphere assigned to them; they foresee and foretell what may or must happen according to the data of science. As Christians we know that, if the words of revelation are taken in their literal sense, our globe will be destroyed by fire.

We see, then, that in regard to the question of the end of the world, there is also no antagonism between the teaching of faith and that of science. Rather, science has demonstrated with equal clearness that, however constant the sum of the energies of the universe, the quantity of vibratory energy or heat increases unceasingly with the loss of visible energy; hence it follows that the whole universe tends to a limited state or existence: it must die. "We find," says Claudius, "a natural law which allows us to infer with certainty that in this universe all things have not an invariable circular course; but that well-determined modifications take place

which will bring about a limit to existence." From this the same scientist infers that the world must have had a beginning. "If the world," he says paradoxically, "were from eternity, it would be dead to-day."

IV. The Bible and Paleontology.

1. *Order of Creation of Organisms.*

Paleontology is a science relating to animals and vegetables which no longer exist, but of which the ruins or fossil remains are found in the depths of the earth's crust. The name fossil is given to those organic bodies, or recognizable traces of them, which are found in the interior strata of the globe. Such fossils are found from granite to the soil of the quaternary period, where unmistakable traces of man appear. Only the general lines of paleontology are yet definitely determined. Its numerous discoveries are nothing compared to those which remain to be made, and its conclusions contradict one another in various points. If the strata which we have mentioned were laid regularly one upon another like the leaves of a book, we should only have to lift them, just as we turn the pages of a book, to read with certainty the relative age of fossil formation. But this is by no means the case; the leaves are scattered, mutilated, or misplaced like the contents of an ill-paged volume. This explains the want of agreement between scholars seeking to reconstruct this book of nature. The discussions wax warmest when there is question of determining the time necessary for the formation of the different strata: some say innumerable centuries; others, a much shorter time; others again explain everything by certain great upheavals of nature. We have no need to range ourselves with any side, and we do not pretend to make paleontology, particularly as it is known at the present day, a confirmation of the Bible. "The twentieth century," says Quinstet, "will probably laugh at our science, just as we laugh at that of our predecessors"; and Lyell

insists that the second half of this century does little but correct the scientific opinions of the first half.

Are the organic remains of animals and plants which we discover in the bosom of the earth buried in the order indicated by the biblical account, and do the periods, as paleontology now presents them, confirm or contradict the six periods of creation rigidly interpreted?

Two theories sum up the hypotheses of scientists in this matter; for it is useless to mention to-day the absolutely untenable notions of those who attribute fossils to earthquakes which have taken place since the fall of the first man. Now, neither of these theories presents anything which could embarrass the Catholic scientist. We must always bear in mind, moreover, that we are in no way obliged to consider the Mosaic relation of the creation and of the formation of the world and the earth as a chronologic-historic account.

First Theory.—This includes the systems which, with a great variety of shades and detail, agree in referring the formation of all fossils to the intermediate period *between* the first creating act and the work of the six days. *Before* this Genesitic week the earth was covered, the theory assumes, with organic beings, and this animal and vegetable world was destroyed by certain catastrophes the effects of which are indicated by these words of the second verse of Genesis: "The earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

This hypothesis cannot contradict the sacred text, since it is absolutely silent upon this point. Let us remark, however, that the theory seems to us to have but little foundation.

Second Theory.—This places the phenomena of fossilization in the Genesitic week by interpreting the days as undetermined periods of time. It assumes that during these periods occurred the great earthquakes which swallowed up whole generations of plants and animals.

This theory also is far from contradicting the Mosaic account. First, it does not prevent us from regarding the

vegetables and animals created during the six days as the ancestors of the present fauna and flora. The sacred text permits the assumption that, during these earthquakes, certain species were definitely destroyed; that others were preserved; finally, that others, after their destruction, were reproduced in the interval of the six periods. This suffices for our end.

It might be asked whether the organic débris of animals and vegetables discovered in the crust of the earth have been buried there in the order followed by the biblical narrative, and, consequently, whether the epochs established at the present day by paleontology confirm or deny the six biblical periods of creation. In answer to this it is enough to repeat that nothing binds us to see a chronologic-historic order in the Mosaic story regarding the formation of the world and of our earth; that there are, however, many Catholic scientists who admit that order of succession and point out a surprising conformity between the Mosaic report and the results of science.

2. *The Origin of Man. Transformism.*[1]

Man was created after the plants, fishes, birds, reptiles, and all the mammalia; he is the last and the highest work of creation, and he owes his existence to an *immediate* and *special* act on the part of God. Such is the teaching of the Bible: "God created man to His own image." The doctrine of the Church on this point is no less clear. Hence a Christian cannot consider man as simply evolved from a monkey or from any animal whatever. Contrary to this doctrine, Darwin, Carl Vogt with others, and as early as the beginning of this century Lamarck, assigned man a different origin.

[1] See references on page 93; also Gaynor, New Materialism; Burnet, Why, etc., ch. 4, 5; Rickaby in C. T. S. i.; articles in A. C. Q. i. 126, ii. 598, 644, viii. 193, xvi. 280; C. W. x. 252, 332, 656, xxv. 90, xxvi. 490, 774, xxxix. 194, 289; M. lxxiv. 14, 203, 491, xciv. 113, 249; D. R., New Ser. xvii. 1, III. Ser. xxi. 51, xxiii. 33.

According to them, he is the result of an incalculable series of successive transformations: a first organism, to which they give the name of monad or protoplasm, etc., underwent progressive development during innumerable centuries, and ended by producing successively all kinds of plants and animals, terminating finally with man. This theory, which includes man himself in the series of evolutions, is absolutely false and inadmissible.

We must beware, however, of confounding *special systems*, pursued too often for an impious and materialistic end, with the *general conception* of transformism. The falseness of preconceived anti-religious systems does not necessarily involve the condemnation of the transformist theory itself.

The transformist theory is that which assumes the general transformation of species by the forces of nature only. It is well known to-day that, by careful culture and intelligent crossing, plants and animals are easily transformed and improved, and new varieties and races obtained. Nature itself, aided by climate, environment, and food, continues to produce before our eyes similar transformations. We naturally ask whether this nature, more powerful than man, and no doubt more efficacious in the beginning of its plastic forms, when the influence of heredity was absent, did not formerly produce not only varieties of race, but new and more perfect species. If this be the case, all the species of plants and animals known at the present day may have developed, in the course of innumerable ages, from a small number of primordial types, or even from one initial type. We have not to examine this question scientifically. Our duty is only to examine whether this theory of transformism, which assumes that more perfect living beings are derived from less perfect living beings, is or is not contrary to Catholic teaching.

We should unhesitatingly answer No if it were a question of vegetables and animals, to the exclusion of man. The Bible affirms, it is true, that God created all the animals,

each according to its kind; but these words could still be verified even if these species were not fixed and unchangeable. Let us remark, however, that the primordial determination of species by the creating act seems rather to indicate a law in virtue of which each species was henceforth to be fixed and immutable.

The question is more grave and complicated in regard to man. Man, by reason of his soul, is so distinct from all organisms that we cannot conceive as possible a natural transition from an animal, even the most perfect animal, to the human nature. Thus the Bible, describing the origin of man, mentions a *special* act of the Creator in the production of his body as well as his soul. But does the *sacred text* formally indicate the *manner* in which God created the body of Adam out of dust? Was it by an *immediate* act of His almighty power, as the words seem to indicate (Gen. ii. 7), or was it through the medium of secondary causes? The philosophic reflections we have just made lead us to accept the biblical account in its most natural sense, that is, in the sense of an immediate act. It has always been so accepted by the Fathers and Catholic interpreters, and so far the partisans of transformism have not produced a single argument casting any real doubt upon this explanation.[1]

[1] Moreover, even if theology permitted us to include in the theory of transformism the body destined to form with the soul a human being, the production of this spiritual soul being absolutely excepted, the opinion would be regarded as illogical by real transformists; for, if plants and brutes are evolved one from another according to their *complete nature*, the law of evolution requires that it should be the same with man: according to the philosophic teaching received among Catholics there is but one soul in man, the spiritual soul, which is the substantial form of the body. It is not easy to evade the force of this objection. Hence genuine transformists, consistent in the application of their system, make no exception in regard to the human soul, and thus fall into the fatal abyss of materialism.

This is where the real danger of the doctrine of transformism lies; it justifies the extreme distrust it inspires in Catholics: Finding that the evident object of many of its advocates is to make this hypothesis

Remark.—Those who, with preconceived bias, try to explain the origin of plants and animals without the intervention of God, will always find it impossible to explain the origin of the elements of matter and of the forces with which it is endowed, as well as the origin of life. It is of no avail for them to proclaim the eternity of matter; they must assign a sufficient reason or cause of its existence; they must say how life came from lifeless matter, intelligence from non-intelligence, the simple from the complex. To these questions they can give no answer; rather, to escape from a truth which hampers them, they are forced to admit *absurdities*.[1]

3. *The Difference between Man and Animals.*

The false systems of transformists who endeavor to class us with the monkey naturally lead to the conclusion that man does not differ essentially from an animal. This in fact is the last word of materialism. Is it not sad to see intelligent men expend *so much mind* in proving that they are nothing but beasts? Truly these words of Scripture are verified: "Man when he was in honor did not understand; he hath been compared to senseless beasts, and is become like them."

These systems, we hasten to add, are far from attracting the majority of true scientists. Nevertheless it may not be amiss to show how ill-founded and absurd they are. It will enable us at least to help unfortunate minds misled by them.

Let us first take note of the declarations made by a goodly number of rationalistic scientists. In proof of the common parentage of man and the monkey, they allege certain human skulls of great age which belonged, they say, to an

the basis of a system of atheistical philosophy, and to establish, under cover of science, the fundamental dogma of materialism, they reject the hypothesis itself as false and impious.

[1] A. C. Q. xi. 58 (Animals and Plants); Mivart, Lessons, etc.

inferior type of populations called anthropomorphic, who hold a middle place between the human form and the monkeys most closely resembling man, such as the chimpanzee, gibbon, gorilla, orang-outang. Unfortunately for those who aspire to this parentage, scientists, who cannot, moreover, be reproached with great orthodoxy, acknowledge that this argument is of little value. Let us be satisfied to quote Virchow. "If we study," says he, "the human fossil of the quaternary period, which is, moreover, the nearest approach to our most remote ancestors, *we always find man such as he is at the present day*. . . . The ancient troglodytes, the inhabitants of coal-pits and lake dwellings, present the appearance of a perfectly respectable society of human beings: they have heads of a dimension which many men of the present day might think themselves fortunate to possess. In short, we are obliged to acknowledge that we have not the smallest fossil type indicating an *inferior state of human development*. What is more, when we estimate the total number of human fossils known at the present day, and compare them with what the present period presents, we can boldly affirm that a much larger number of individuals of relative inferiority is found among living men than among the fossils so far discovered. . . . There has not yet been found a single fossil skull of monkey or man-monkey which could have belonged to a human being." Huxley, another rationalist, speaks no less clearly or categorically. "The structural differences existing between man and the monkey are not," he says, "either small or insignificant, and the human fossils so far discovered indicate no approach whatever toward the pithecoid form" (that is, the man-monkey).

Zoologists most in favor of our simian origin acknowledge that the researches of paleontology have never succeeded in finding the *slightest trace of a species* from which developed, on the one hand, man and, on the other, the anthropoid species, which, according to their transformist theories, served as common ancestor to the monkey of the present day and to

us. This is not all: as the transformations according to Darwinism were effected only by imperceptible transitions, by the fortuitous acquisition of an advantage at first very slight, it follows that there must have been between man and the monkey most closely resembling him a *long series of intermediaries*. Now, notwithstanding the most diligent researches, not one of these intermediary fossils has ever been found. To affirm gratuitously that they are to be found in the submerged lands is to leave the domain of science for that of pure hypothesis.

Finally, whatever resemblance may be established as existing between man and the monkey, it does not authorize us in concluding a common ancestor: that a thing is possible does not argue its existence. Moreover, we shall demonstrate that there are great and radical differences between these two zoological types, and we shall give a few direct proofs which attest the nobility and excellence of human nature.

Thesis.—Man Differs Essentially from Animals.[1]

First Proof.—Anatomical and Physiological Differences between Man and the Monkey. Is it astonishing that there are certain osteologic resemblances (structure of the bones) between man and the monkey? Is not man defined a reasoning animal? Is it not clear, therefore, that there must be some resemblance between him and an unreasoning animal? But if that is sufficient to make us monkeys, we might claim, with just as much appearance of truth, that we are perfected lions or tigers, for the anatomical structure of our digestive organs, for example, is exactly like that of these carnivorous animals. But if there are points of resemblance between man and animals, there are notable and very characteristic points of difference. First, man walks erect, the monkey is a quadruped and climbs; the gorilla itself,

[1] Mivart, Man and Ape; Lessons, ch. 6 ff.; Maher, p. 546 ff.; Thein, Anthropol., ch. 4 ff.

which is cited as the nearest approach to man among existing monkeys, can preserve a vertical attitude only for a very short time; the soles of the feet, the hands, the vertical attitude, the development and conformation of the brain, the laugh, the organs of mastication, etc., are so different in man and the monkey most closely resembling him that a naturalist must needs be inspired with hatred of his own excellence to conclude that he and these creatures form anatomically the same class. The single circumstance of the almost complete absence of hair on the body of man, particularly on the back, is so significant that Wallace declares that it creates a difficulty impossible for Darwinism to solve, and he adds that Darwin and Haeckel are much annoyed with him for having had the imprudence to point it out. There is nothing more frivolous, or rather more ridiculous, than the explanations they attempt to give of this partial nakedness of the human skin.

Let us hear, moreover, what serious scientists say, and particularly M. de Quatrefages, whose word has long been an authority in this matter. He concludes a report on the progress of anthropology with the following words: "There exists no possible passage between man and the monkey, unless we introvert the laws of development"; that is, unless materialists overthrow at one blow the system which they have elaborated with great difficulty. Carl Vogt himself, atheist and cynic as he is, is most scathing in his raillery of those among his friends who rank man in the same class with animals.

Second Proof. Intellectual, Moral, and Religious Differences.—Though the physical resemblance between man and the monkey were still greater, it would prove absolutely nothing, for what constitutes man and his real superiority is not his skeleton, but his rational and free soul, his moral and religious nature. This is not a simple difference of *degree*, but a difference of *nature*, of *essence*. Let us develop this capital truth.

A. Man alone has *intelligence*, for he alone reasons; he alone speaks; he alone invents and is indefinitely perfectible.[1]

a. MAN ALONE REASONS. — Animals are endowed with instinct, that is, with a blind, spontaneous impulse which is not the result of reflection, but of organization, and which is consequently irresistible, uniform, invariable. The animal, impelled by this interior principle, does not act freely or with any consciousness of itself. It perceives only the phenomena which impress the senses (POTIUS AGITUR QUAM AGIT). Man, on the contrary, endowed with intelligence, with reason, possesses the consciousness of himself and the reflected consciousness of his acts. He alone is capable of forming abstract, universal, absolute ideas; he alone is capable of generalizing and of grasping the substantial causes of the phenomena which strike his senses, and not the phenomena only; he alone has knowledge of purely spiritual beings; he alone comprehends the beautiful, the true, the good; armed with the laws of logic, he reasons, he learns, he daily acquires new knowledge. Animals are wholly devoid of these things. It is true that with persuasion and threats they may be made to do many things; but who ever thinks, for example, of reasoning even with the cleverest animal? Who could seriously believe it possessed of intelligence, that is, of the power of forming abstract, intellectual, universal ideas from material images furnished by the senses?[2]

b. MAN ALONE SPEAKS.—We hear animals emit cries by which they express what they feel, pleasure or pain; but they have no language properly speaking, for they cannot express thoughts, which they have not. The animal which manifests its impressions does not do so freely and is not aware of this manifestation. Their cries are simply an intermediary of which they are unconscious, and the cleverest parrot is only a sort of repeating machine, a living phonograph. We may

[1] Mivart, Origin of Human Reason; A. C. Q. ix.
[2] Lacordaire, 5th conf. on God.

theorize over the alleged language of animals, but it is incontestable that only man speaks with the explicit and formal intention of communicating his thoughts; besides, when he speaks, when he converses, when he teaches, when he argues it is most frequently for the sole purpose of expressing his thoughts, of communicating knowledge to his interlocutor.[1]

c. ONLY MAN IS PERFECTIBLE, AND HE ALONE INVENTS.—The animal never goes beyond the limits of his instinct. No doubt, as we have just said, by making use of the senses, of the memory, of the sensible imagination of the animal, we may succeed in correcting in him certain faults, in teaching him certain habits, in a word, by utilizing the instincts of the animal as we utilize the forces of nature; but we can say, nevertheless, that the animal at birth is completely formed, and that of itself it is unperfectible. Left to its instinct, it would always remain what its species was at the beginning of the world. The bees build their hives to-day as they did in the time of Solomon, and the habits of animals are still what Aristotle describes them: progress supposes reflection, reason, general ideas, and rational abstraction.

B. Only man has a *moral sense*, a sense of duties imposed upon his conscience. He not only distinguishes between virtue and vice, but he has the faculty of enjoying the good he does and of suffering by the evil he commits; he alone also possesses the idea of future life bringing to him the merited reward or punishment. No doubt we see animals abstain from certain things, but it is only through instinct, and through fear of physical chastisement which their sensible memory recalls; it certainly is not to avoid a moral evil, a remorse of conscience. If man feels the responsibility of his actions, if he is capable of merit or demerit, it is in consequence of his *liberty* or the faculty of choosing between means which lead to an end; now this faculty also belongs only to man;

[1] A. C. Q. xi. 226; D. R., N. Ser. xxx. 139; Mivart, on Truth, ch. 16; Lessons, ch. 4; Maher, Psychol., p. 432 ff., 552; also Lacordaire's beautiful remarks in his 4th conf. on God and Man.

the animal has only instinct which does not permit it to deliberate and to make a reasonable choice: POTIUS AGITUR QUAM AGIT. Therefore, it is not responsible for its acts; if we punish, if we kill an injurious animal, it is not because we regard it as guilty, but to prevent it from doing further harm by following the same instinct. It is quite otherwise with man; whatever the impressions made upon him by sensible objects, he can always act independently of his feeling of attraction or repulsion. "Man," says Bossuet, "is so completely master of his body that he can even sacrifice it to a greater good."[1]

C. Man alone has a *religious sense.* Religion, that tendency which impels us to seek God, to aspire to Him, which makes us feel our need to place ourselves in union with Him, is so exclusively possessed by man that pagans long since proposed to define man a *religious animal.*

This is the teaching of philosophy and plain common sense, confirmed by the testimony of the most eminent scholars. "Man alone," says M. Quatrefages, "possesses the idea of good and of moral evil, independently of all welfare or of all physical suffering; he believes in superior beings capable of influencing his destiny; he believes in the prolongation of his existence after this life. . . . Never in any animal whatever has anything similar or even analogous been found."

As to the alleged existence of peoples without religion, let us be satisfied to refute it by quoting a few eminent authorities. "I declare," says the same scholar, "that I do not know of a *single people* that can, with any appearance of truth, be called atheists." He also says elsewhere: "Obliged by my teaching itself to examine all the human races, I have searched for atheism in the lowest as well as in the most civilized peoples; I have never found it except individually, or in more or less restricted schools such as were seen in Europe in the last century, and are still to be seen at the

[1] Lacordaire, 6th conf. on God.

present day. . . . Nowhere has atheism anything but an erratic existence. . . . This is the result of a search which I may be permitted to call conscientious. . . . " The celebrated Livingston also says: "However degraded the African people, they have no need to be taught the existence of God or to be told of a future life: these two truths are universally recognized in Africa."

CONCLUSION.—From the foregoing we may rightly conclude that, aside from the very marked differences between the organisms of man and beast, there is, from an intellectual, moral, and religious point of view, an impassable gulf between them. This threefold difference is less striking, perhaps, than the organic differences, as it does not fall under the senses and cannot be touched with the scalpel. But in reality it is far greater than that which separates the animal from the vegetable kingdom.

In concluding our remarks on this question we should like to quote, with a few modifications, a page from the Abbé Caussette: "How did it ever enter the mind of a rational man to place himself on a level with the ape? What progress has the ape achieved during the ages that he has been gambolling in the forests? We behold man, on the contrary, moving proudly through the treasures of his mind which fill the libraries and museums of Rome, of Paris, of Munich, of London, or amid the marvels of a world's exposition, the fruit of his intelligence and skill. 'Behold,' he exclaims, 'I am the author of the immortal Iliad of Homer, of the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas; I bear the name of Plato, of Augustine, of Bossuet; I have composed the glorious strains of a Rossini, of a Gluck; I have thrilled the old world and the new with the accents of a Pindar, a Euripides, a Racine, a Corneille; I built the Parthenon, I flung into the clouds the lordly dome of St. Peter's; I have weighed the stars, analyzed their elements, and followed the path of suns in the depths of the heavens; I have discovered unknown continents and ruled the vast seas; I have

brought to light and learned the nature of a whole world of animalcules, and I have added a decade to the life of my fellow men; bending the forces of nature to my will, I speak with the rapidity of lightning to my brothers at the extreme ends of the earth; I have made steam my chariot; my work is the civilization of Babylon, Athens, Rome, and Christian Europe. Show me the cities built, the books produced, the masterpieces achieved, the discoveries accomplished by the ape from whom, you dare to affirm, I am descended, and I may think that you speak seriously.' "

4. *The Unity of the Human Species and its Descent from Adam.*[1]

"God," says St. Paul (Acts xvii. 26), "hath made of one, all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth." It is an article of faith that all men who now people the earth are descended from Adam; this dogma, is moreover, intimately connected with that of original sin, of redemption, etc. It is rejected, nevertheless, by the *polygenists*, who contend that there are *several different species* among men. The *monogenists*, on the contrary, acknowledge that all men form but *one species*, though in this species there are several different races.

Before proving that Scripture is in no way at variance with true science, let us make a few preliminary observations.

First Observation.—The Bible does not clearly affirm the *specific* unity of mankind, but only the unity of *origin*, that is, the *Adamic* unity of all the human races. It follows that the Christian dogma would not be overturned by admitting that the many varieties or races of the descendants of Adam, brought about in the long course of time, constitute so many new species. However, we affirm and shall presently prove that mankind has not only a common origin, but forms only *one single species*.

Second Observation.—The most ardent defenders of the polygenist doctrine acknowledge that, scientifically speaking,

[1] See p. 63; also Lenormant, Quatrefages, Guibert.

it is of very recent date. Its partisans, moreover, are few in number, while a very large majority of scientists hold to unity of species, and even to unity of stock, Adamic unity. Among them are Blumenbach, Pritchard, Linnée, Buffon, Cuvier, Van Baer, Van Meyer, Burdach, Etienne and Isidore Geoffroy, Saint-Hilaire, de Blainville, Hugh Miller, de Serres, Flourens, de Quatrefages, Milne-Edwards, Lyell, Huxley. Hence science and revelation are by no means at variance on this capital point. Let us remark further that the traditions of all nations, whether oral or recorded in the most ancient books, are strikingly unanimous in representing the human race as descended from one single couple.

THIRD OBSERVATION.—*a*. Is it not remarkable that certain scholars hesitate to believe in human races, unwilling to admit anything but species in humanity, yet readily acknowledge the existence of these varieties and these races in vegetables and animals, where the diversity is even greater than among men? Think, for example, of the different varieties of radishes, of cabbages, of wheat, of pears, of apples, that we have before our eyes; the vine alone has at least a thousand varieties which grow like the parent stock. And in the animal kingdom we know that there are 300 kinds of pigeons. In the exposition of 1858 Europe alone furnished 28 races of dogs, presenting from one to five variations in shape; in hair, from the thickest to the perfectly smooth or hairless; in color, from black to white, with every intermediate shade and color; in voice, from the dumb to the loud-baying hound; in the number of caudal vertebræ from none to 21; in the shape of the head, from the greyhound to the bulldog. Observe that all these races continuously and indefinitely reproduce themselves.

b. It is still more remarkable that the men who proclaim the impossibility of a common descent for the negro and the white man are the ones who admit the simian origin of man as a reasonable hypothesis or as a fact. What is the explanation of this inconsistency? Here is the explanation given

by Van Baer, the most celebrated naturalist of Russia: "This opinion [of the plurality of species in the human race, so contrary to all the principles of natural history, is it not a thing invented by the Anglo-Americans to quiet their consciences? When they inhumanly and barbarously drove out the oldest inhabitants of America and imported negroes to make them slaves, was it not natural to argue: 'we owe no duty to these men, they are of a race inferior to us'?"

What we have just said may suffice to destroy the value of the objections against the Bible raised by the polygenists. But let us establish our thesis more directly.

First Argument.—We may consider it an axiom in zoology that all individuals capable of reproducing and indefinitely perpetuating themselves are of *one and the same species*. Species, M. Flourens says, consists essentially in two ideas: that of resemblance and that of filiation. We may define it as a collection of individuals possessed of common characteristics, which they transmit, by means of reproduction, to other individuals capable of preserving these fundamental characteristics, and susceptible at the same time of secondary variations. In fact each species is capable of great modifications, but these modifications, which affect only the accidental and not the essential properties, do not change the typical resemblances or the faculty of reproduction; they simply constitute what we call varieties, which take in their turn, when they become permanent, the names of races. Thus the bulldog, the poodle, the hound, the terrier, belong, notwithstanding the great difference in their exterior form, to the same species.

Continual reproduction, therefore, is the positive mark of species: it is this characteristic which enables us in doubtful cases to decide whether plants or animals belong to the same species. This was the opinion of Aristotle, and it is still that of a large majority of scientists. If, therefore, it is proved that all the human races, from the most civilized European to the lowest negro, are capable of continual

reproduction, there exists but one human species. Now this is undeniable: experience shows that human races, even the most barbarous, united with the most perfect produce individuals indefinitely fruitful. This fact is so incontestably established that we do not think it necessary to support it with authorities. Hence our thesis is demonstrated.

This is a fundamental and decisive proof, but let us add, nevertheless, a few subsidiary arguments.

SECOND ARGUMENT.—Not only do we find all the human races capable of continual reproduction, but *resemblance between individuals*, though it is a much less important characteristic, is also proved. In fact,

a. The physical organization, in its essential parts, is the same in all men; the points of dissimilarity are trifling compared to those of the spaniel and the bulldog or the terrier, which all agree, nevertheless, in ranking in the same species. In all the human races we find the same shaped skull, the same cerebral layers, the same number of teeth, arranged in the same order and of the same length, the same shape of the hands, as well as the opposable thumb and index-finger, the same vertical position, the same vocal organs greatly perfected. Nowhere else do we find as great conformity, even between different species. Let us not lose sight of an important remark of Herder's. "We usually," he says, "reckon only four principal human races; but the varieties are in reality inestimable, we find every intermedium; colors are blended in some, and, in the same race, the aspect of individuals differs in regard to color as well as structure."

b. From an *intellectual, religious*, and *moral* point of view the resemblance is no less great. All men are endowed with reason and the faculty of speaking an articulate language, of expressing their thoughts for the sole purpose of communicating them; even the negro is capable of a remarkable intellectual and moral development; the most uncivilized races are susceptible of a progressive civilization; all are endowed with moral and religious sentiment, though in different degrees.

THIRD ARGUMENT.—They who advance a new doctrine must prove it. Now the polygenists have no positive proofs to oppose to ours. First, they cannot demonstrate the impossibility of several human races springing from *one species;* still less can they prove the impossibility of the descent of all men from one couple. We, on the contrary, can give sufficient explanation of the differences we observe in the various races. It has been proved that climate, the general habit of life, and heredity produce this diversity. At the same time, if we were unable to assign the causes of these differences, there would be nothing astonishing in our perplexity, for it is a question of origin, and we know that questions of the kind are usually impenetrable or wrapt in mystery.

REMARKS.—1st. The differences observed among various human races are not as important as many naturalists make them out to be.

One of the most striking things when men of different races are brought together is the color of the skin. This coloration, which ranges from the pale white of the albino to the dusky brown of the negro, is due to the pigment, the coloring matter contained in the cells of the skin. Now we know that this coloration depends principally upon locality or environment, that is, upon climate, air, water, heat, or cold, as well as social and religious conditions. Thus the skin of the European becomes brown in the tropics and almost copper color after a long sojourn in Guinea, and in the Marquesas Islands it assumes a shade as dark as that of the natives. Labor in the field is sufficient to produce the bronze hue. The negro in his turn becomes lighter in temperate climates. No doubt the distance is great between the white Swede and the negro of Congo or the Caribbean Islands, but there is a multitude of imperceptible shades between these two latitudes, white, yellow, copper-color, brown, and black. These effects of environment are no less evident in animals than in man. In Guinea, birds and dogs are all black; at the poles, on the contrary, the animals soon become white in winter unless

they are housed. In short, color is a thing so accessory that a skilful breeder, for example, can in three years give pigeons any plumage he chooses.

Nor is the hair, specialists say, a more distinctive characteristic. It is woolly, crinkly, long and glossy, black or red, according to the hygienic régime, country, and the mixture of races. Under the microscope the hair called woolly is found to be of the same composition as the other kinds. Here also the grades are so gradual as to be almost imperceptible.

As to the shape, weight, and capacity of the cranium, there is no more variety among the various races of men than among the various races of animals. Why then should these differences, which are never considered as indicating several species when there is question of animals, be considered as an argument against unity of species when there is question of man? Moreover, the American Morton, whose opinion on this point is shared by several other polygenists, has proved, by measuring 1200 craniums, that the objection founded on the capacity of the cranium is of no real importance. In a series of 964 craniums examined by Wagner for size and capacity of holding an amount of brain matter, the skull of Dr. Depuytren the celebrated physician, ranked only as the 170th, while that of the mineralogist Hausman ranked 640th in the whole scale of the 964. Though it is true that the brain is, generally, developed in proportion to the degree of intelligence, yet facts prove that we cannot derive any certain conclusion from the weight of the brain. "We must accept the fact," says M. Flourens, "that the size of the brain does not indicate the amount of intelligence."

It is the same in regard to the shape of the skull and the facial angle. This facial angle averages, according to Camper, 70 degrees in the negro and 85 in the pure Greek type: this variation of 15 degrees cannot evidently constitute a specific difference, particularly as every intermediate degree is found between the negro and the scale of the Greek statues. Very different is the variation between the facial angle of the negro

and that of a full-grown chimpanzee: the latter hardly measures 35 degrees. Haeckel himself acknowledges that the shape of the skull affords no basis for classifying the human species. There are long and short heads and all intermediaries in the same people. A remarkable thing is that in the prognathic type the protruding maxillaries, resembling the snout of an animal, are not that shape at birth, but become so with age; we find them, moreover, in all peoples, even the most civilized.

2d. To understand the possibility of reaching the most distant islands in order to people them, we need only remark that nowhere is communication between one country and another more difficult than in the South Sea Islands; yet we have evidence which proves that these difficulties are not only surmountable, but that they have been really overcome: the marked resemblance in the idiom, customs, traditions, and religion of the various peoples of the Pacific will not permit us to doubt the reality of migrations to these latitudes.

As to the peopling of America, in particular,there is no certainty that the American continent was always separated from Asia as it is now; besides, it requires only 36 hours to go from Asia to America. In addition to this, the cold current from the Arctic Ocean flowing through Behring Strait brings to the American continent all the vessels wrecked in the Pacific Ocean. Thus since 1852, that is, since California was settled by the whites, there have reached the country some thirty ships from Asia, sixteen of which contained passengers. Finally, there are proofs of various kinds which establish the fact that several nations of the Old World, particularly the Phenicians, the Norman-Scandinavians, the Indians, the Chinese, the Japanese, contributed to people America. The yellow race is still represented in Brazil by the Botocondos.

3d. The objection against unity of species founded on the question of language is of no value whatever.[1] What relation can there be between the different species of men and the conventional meaning attached to certain sounds,

[1] Schanz, I., ch. 17; Walworth, ch. 27; Thein, Anthrop., ch. 9 ff.; The Bible, etc., p. iv.

when among the same people, as it sometimes happens, the same sounds convey different meanings? We know what perpetual changes unwritten language is subject to, and in how short a time savage nations can change their language. The case is very different with languages spoken by partially civilized people and languages fixed by writing and enriched by literary monuments. Men of the same region by no means follow the same grammar and the same dictionary. It is estimated that the English peasantry use only about three hundred words, though the English language contains about one hundred thousand. Hence philologists, Renan among others, while denying the primitive unity of language, acknowledge that it affords no proof against the primitive unity of species. "Whatever the diversity existing," says Max Müller, "in the forms and in the roots of languages, it affords no conclusive argument against the possibility of a common origin of these languages." The Scripture, moreover, attesting the confusion of languages, it is not necessary that we should find a common derivation or origin for languages. Let us add that philology itself tends more and more to prove the unity of origin of all men; it is this science which has afforded us positive proof of the common origin of peoples inhabiting the opposite extremities of the earth.

5. *Antiquity of the Human Race.*[1]

Life has not always existed upon the earth, and among the beings endowed with life man is the *most recent;* he came after the plants and animals. Here are points upon which natural science agrees with the Bible. But while Genesis seems to indicate that it is only a few thousand years since man appeared upon the earth, there are naturalists and historians who unhesitatingly affirm that the human race is at

[1] See p. 63; especially Zahm, Bible, Science, etc., p. iii; also Lenormant; Thein, Anthrop., ch. 8 ff.; The Bible, etc., p. iv; Schanz, I., ch. 18; A. C. Q. xix. 260; C. W. xl. 318, 444.

least one hundred thousand years old; others say even a hundred thousand centuries. We can readily understand that they who hold that we are descended from anthropoid monkeys must needs insist upon great antiquity, for no doubt it took a good portion of time for man to rise from the state of the beast to the moral, intellectual, and religious condition found among the oldest races.[1] Let us consider what the Bible and science teach on the subject of the age of man. We shall see that, here again, there is no opposition between these two legitimate means of knowledge.

1. The Uncertainty of Biblical Chronology.—The Scripture makes no formal statement in regard to the age of man, and the Church, which is not obliged to regulate questions of chronology, has given no decision upon the subject. There is, it is true, a chronology called biblical, because based upon the elements of Scripture. But what is the value of a chronology of this kind, the work of man? To appreciate its weight as an authority we have only to remember that there are almost as many chronologic systems of the Bible as there are exegetes. Des Vignolles, in 1738, counted more than two hundred, varying to the extent of thirty-five centuries, yet notwithstanding all these efforts we have never succeeded in bringing order out of this chaos. Therefore, the learned Abbé Hir declares that "biblical chronology is fluctuating and undecided, and that it is for human sciences to find the date of the creation of our species."

What is the reason of this uncertainty? It arises from various causes, the chief of which are these:

a. We do not always know the true figures originally written by the sacred writers either in the Pentateuch or the other inspired books; all the ancient texts we possess disagree in

[1] On *Primeval Man not a Savage* cf., besides the authors already quoted in this chapter, Thebaud, Gentilism, ch. 3; Br. W. ix. (often); A. C. Q. xi. 226; C. W. ix. 766, xiii. 492, xxix. 602; B. C. Y., The Remote Antiquity of Man not Proven; Primeval Man not a Savage (London, 1877).

this matter. According to the Hebrew and that of the Vulgate, for example, only 1656 years elapsed from the fall of Adam to the deluge; and from the time of Noe to Abraham, 292. According to the text of the Septuagint these figures are respectively 2262 and 1172; finally, according to the Samaritan Pentateuch they are 1307 and 942. This disagreement is not remarkable; for we know that in successive transcriptions, nothing is more easily altered than figures, particularly when every people has its special divisions of time, and the majority of nations a method of computation entirely different from ours. Errors, therefore, would naturally be made either in the copies or the versions. God evidently is not obliged to work miracles to preserve scriptural dates unaltered, for they have nothing whatever to do with morals or dogma, or with the substance of the sacred text; our salvation and the fulfilment of our duty are in no way compromised because we are relatively ignorant of the number of years which elapsed from the fall of Adam to the coming of the Redeemer.

b. We have no assurance that we possess complete genealogic lists. All that we have in the shape of historic records concerning this period is the lists of the antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs contained in Genesis. Now there is no doubt that in these lists there is at least one hiatus, or perhaps an interpolation. May there not in fact be a great many? This is very probable, particularly as the only object of the Oriental nations, in their genealogies, is to follow the direct line regardless of intermediate branches; hence whole generations, that is, centuries, may have dropped out of the calculation. This remark of M. Wallon is further confirmed by a large number of analogous omissions, proved to exist in other books of the Scriptures. These systematic omissions ought, it would seem, to be assigned to a mnemonic cause. Thus, it is evident that St. Matthew expressly excludes the names of three well-known kings in order to make the dry list of names forming the genealogical tree of the

Messias more easily retained. These omissions, the extent of which we do not know, make it impossible to determine the period of man's appearance on earth.

The variations which we find in the figures of the three sources have still another no less important cause. The Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch regularly add one hundred years to several Hebrew dates. Why? We are obliged to answer with St. Augustine, who had already observed this fact, "We give no explanation where the explanation would be unsatisfactory." However this may be, as the chronology of the Septuagint has been adopted by all the Fathers of the Greek Church and by the majority of the Latin Fathers, there is nothing to prevent our accepting it. Following it, we estimate the age of man to be 8065 years. At the same time there is no reason why this figure may not be subject to any modifications necessary to meet the just claims of history and paleontology.

But may not profane science now remove the doubts still unsolved by the study of the sacred text? This is what we are about to examine by consulting successively paleontology and the history of ancient peoples.

II. Data of Science.—A. Geology and Paleontology. —Despite the figures hazarded without proof by a certain number of geologists and paleontologists, science, so far, offers nothing absolutely certain on the subject. The existence of man in the tertiary period is still unproved. We know that in 1884 the Association for the Advancement of Science held at Blois one of its most important sessions, and that forty members of the congress were deputed to study the layers of Thenay belonging to the tertiary period, and which contained, it was said, a quantity of flints cut by the hand of man. Now the result of their careful investigation was to convince them that man did not exist at that period, and that the marks on the flints were due simply to physical causes. Nor is there any more authority for the flints concerning which there has been much discussion; for example,

those found in the neighborhood of Aurillac and the vicinity of Lisbon. In regard to the quaternary period, which contains a quantity of human fossils the age and authenticity of which are incontestable, let us hear the opinion of a master of geological science, M. Lapparrent: "That part of the modern era called the quaternary epoch is characterized by the appearance of man on the earth. . . . This period, notwithstanding its proximity to our own time, is still enveloped in mystery. The succession of the deposits is sometimes very obscure. The absence or the rarity of organic remains renders it particularly difficult to determine the relative age. . . . Science has not yet achieved a chronometer enabling it to measure past time, even the period immediately preceding our own. It is wise to expect this achievement only of the future, and, for our part, we are satisfied with having shown how baseless are all these calculations generously distributing hundreds and thousands of centuries between the various phases of the quaternary period."

This is the last word of science up to the present time. Moreover, Lyell himself, so given to exaggeration on this point, acknowledges that, "In the present state of our knowledge, the attempts to compare the chronologic relations of the periods of upheavals . . . and of the retirement of the glaciers . . . must be considered as simple conjectures." Other serious paleontologists hold the same language, and Carl Vogt does not hesitate to declare that, "So far, all efforts to establish a means of chronologically estimating the time that has elapsed since man appeared upon the earth, have been ineffectual." Though, in truth, this declaration has not prevented him from heaping hypotheses upon hypotheses, and from attributing 57,600 years of existence to a human skeleton found at New Orleans.

Chronometers.[1]—The authorities cited excuse us from speak-

[1] The author speaks of *Geological Chronometers*, a term used to designate such articles and objects found in the various strata of the earth which may serve as time-measures to indicate the age of man's

ing in detail of the various chronometers, the subject of so much discussion and which, it is said, afford conclusive proof of the great age of man. A word, however, of some of them: it will give us some idea of the precaution necessary in researches of this kind in order to arrive at even a probable conclusion.

It was believed that proofs of the antiquity of man were to be found in human fossils discovered in caves, where they were mixed with the bones of animals of extinct races; in splinters of flints which had served as arms or utensils to our ancestors; in the formation of the deltas, particularly those of the Nile and the Mississippi; in the peat-moors; in the diluvium of valleys and plains; in the downs of Denmark and Norway; in the lake dwellings of Switzerland; in the stalactites and stalagmites; and in the kitchen utensils of the Scandinavians.

1st. In order to draw a scientific conclusion from, for example, the bones of human fossils, we must at least be very certain, 1st, that these fossils have been found in strata older than the quaternary period; 2d, that their appearance in virgin soil is not due to the hand of man, or caused by some upheaval of nature; 3d, that their origin has not been altered either by the falsification of a museum, or by a systematic interpretation. Now none of these things are established with any certainty. Moreover, we repeat that it is not easy to distinguish the superior strata of the tertiary period from the primary strata of the quaternary; that we have no means of appreciating the duration of the geological formations, of estimating how much older one is than another, or of determining how far back each of these formations dates.

2d. The same remarks apply to cut, polished, or other kinds of flints found in large numbers in the bosom of the earth, and which may have served as arms or utensils to our an-

presence upon earth and the duration of the different phases in the development of the race.—EDITOR.

cestors; we must also be sure that the object found is truly a product of human industry; that the strata in which it lay was free from the action of man and the violence of the elements; then we must be able to determine with certainty the age of the strata itself. Now let us hear the opinion of a competent authority like M. Dumoulins: "I declare in my own name and in that of M. Gourges that, in the thirty-five years that we have been studying these implements, we have never found any in strata undisturbed by the hand of man." As to the cut flints, particularly, we know that the marks upon them which are presumed to indicate that they are the result of human industry, are frequently only the effect of lightning, of the sun's heat, of sudden changes of temperature, of pressure, of shocks, etc. At the congress of Lisbon the following opinion was given by its president, Dr. Virchow: "Ten years ago I put," he says, "this question to myself: Can we recognize in a few splinters of flint whether their form is or is not the result of intention? . . . It is a question likely to excite much discussion at several congresses. . . . Here we disagree, and there are many naturalists who deny that these flints are the work of man. . . . At the next congress I will submit samples, bearing all the characters claimed, which I have collected under conditions which make it impossible that man could have had anything to do with them."

3d. The formation of deltas and alluvia generally was also supposed, for a time, to furnish useful results. The term alluvia is applied to formations produced by the denudation of the soil, great rains, inundations, or the deposits of rivers. It is now well established that nothing is more irregular than such formations, for these deposits and inundations vary considerably according to circumstances. They must also have been much more rapid before the mountains were denuded of vegetation. As to the objects found there, it is clear from the nature of the soil itself that they do not belong to it. Now the force of currents, Lyell himself acknowledges,

may bring together in a very short time objects which perhaps have been separated for centuries. Mr. J. Ferguson, an English geologist living in India, gives an instance of an inundation during which bricks from the foundation of a house which he had built, were carried away by the waters and buried in the bed of the river at a depth of from thirty to forty feet. "The river," he says, "has passed on, and a new village now stands on the spot where my bungalow stood, but forty feet above the ruins; and any one who chooses to dig on the spot may find my reliquia there, and form what theory he likes as to their antiquity or my age." Let us further remark that Carl Vogt claims 158,400 years for the formation of the delta of the Mississippi, while Sir John Lubbock thinks it required only 3000 years, and M. Schmidt only 1700.

4th. Nor do the peat moors or bogs afford anything more conclusive. These bogs consist of accumulations of detrite vegetable matter from which a combustible is formed. It is impossible to find in these accumulations any means of estimating their vertical increase. According to experiments made in East Friesland it would require only two hundred years for the formation of a stratum of peat thirty feet in depth, while according to the theory of M. Boucher de Perthes it would take no less than three thousand years! Burmeister affirms, on his part, that he has seen completely exhausted peat-bogs grow again to the depth of five feet in thirty years.

The depths at which objects are found buried in the peat-moors give us no reliable information; for, on the one hand, we know that the more recent and liquid the formation the more easily objects sink in it; and that, on the other hand, if we were to accept the theoretical estimates of some geologists in regard to the alleged slowness of peat formations, the objects contained in them must be antediluvian productions; while, as a matter of fact, the coins, axes, and kitchen utensils found in them are nearly all of Roman origin. What confidence can be placed in such calculations?

5th. We know that lake dwellings, dwellings built upon piles, have been discovered in large numbers recently, particularly in the lakes of Switzerland. It was hoped that the study of the horn and stone implements, the household effects, and the skulls of the inhabitants, which were also found there, would throw some light upon science. But no results were obtained: the oldest skulls discovered are in every respect like those of the Swiss of the present day; the plants and animals are also the same as ours. Hence eminent geologists think that these dwellings possess, relatively, but little antiquity. Hochstetter thinks it very probable that the lake cities date no farther back than the tenth century before the Christian era. Franz Maurer thinks them still nearer our time, and Hastler dates the most recent from the third century before Christ. As to the accumulation of gravel under which they are buried, Wagner declares that it may have been formed in as many moments as Morlot assigns years for it.

Conclusion.—Science, notwithstanding all its efforts, is far from furnishing us any certain information in regard to the antiquity of the human species. Biblical chronology, on the other hand, leaves us in uncertainty. Therefore there is no possibility of contradiction between the sacred text and natural sciences.

B. History.—We know that all nations, particularly the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Hindoos, and Chinese, have the vanity to attribute to themselves a fabulous antiquity which is lost in the night of time.[1] Cicero has already remarked this fact. Let us see if history verifies their claim.

1. Egypt.—The accounts of Greek travellers who visited Egypt in ancient times give us information in regard to its chronology. But the data furnished by Solon, Herodotus, Varro, and Diodorus of Sicily are so vague and, above all, so contradictory that no reliance can be placed upon their

[1] D. R. April '77. On the *religious systems* of these peoples see Schanz, II., ch. 2, 3.

figures. This, however, is not astonishing: these writers did not know the language of Egypt, hence immediate sources of information were closed to them. They may also have misunderstood the information furnished by interpreters; and what guarantee, moreover, have we of the accuracy or truthfulness of the latter? As to Manetho, who lived in Egypt, but only about the year 300 before Christ, we must remember that his history, written in Greek, is no longer in existence; all that remains of it is a summary of its chronology, which was preserved to us by Eusebius; but how may such a document help us to reach a satisfactory result? First of all, the extreme insignificance of the facts which he relates shows us that he was a man very imperfectly acquainted with the early history of Egypt. Then, though the monuments prove that several kings reigned together during a certain time, Manetho enumerates all the dynasties as if the reigns had been successive. Finally, in thirty-seven cases in which we can check the figures of this historian by those of the papyrus of Turin, which contains a list of the kings of Egypt, we find that he increases the duration of twenty-two reigns and diminishes that of six.

Let us consider the third source of information. This consists of the lists containing the names of the kings of Egypt, particularly the papyrus of Turin, unfortunately incomplete, and the tablets of Abydos, Saqqarah, and Karnak. We have also the hieroglyphic inscriptions relating, on the walls of the temples, the exploits of the Egyptian monarchs, the stelæ of the court officers and of various other personages, the Apis stelæ and figured monuments of all kinds.

But in none of these do we find any complete information. Moreover, as Fr. Lenormant says, "the greatest obstacle to the establishment of a regular Egyptian chronology is the fact that the Egyptians themselves never had a chronology." And how could they have a chronologic system when they had no era? Thus Mariette insists that modern science will fail in every attempt to restore what the Egyptians never

possessed. Brugsch is of the same opinion: "In the present state of things no man living," he says, "is capable of removing the obstacles which hinder the re-establishment of the original list of kings contained in the fragments of the papyrus of Turin." The greatest obstacle is probably the fact that the Egyptian historians confine themselves to stating the duration of each reign without mentioning whether the sovereign reigned alone or jointly with another; and that they represent dynasties as consecutive which were contemporaneous.

The historic documents of Egypt, therefore, furnish no certain chronology, nor can they demonstrate that the chronology derived from the Septuagint is too short. This is the well-grounded conclusion of the Abbé Vigouroux. Scholars, he adds, who claim more time, base their demand upon a personal opinion which nothing obliges us to accept.

If we want a striking proof of the truth of these assertions, it is to be found in the very disagreement of the various modern historians who have dealt with the history of Egypt. While Bockh places the accession of Menes, the first known king, in the year 5702 before our era, Mariette and Lenormant assign it to the year 5004, Brugsch to 4455, Bunsen to 3623 or 3059, Wilkinson to 2691. As Mr. George Rawlinson wisely remarks: "It is as if the best authorities on Roman history were to tell us, the one that the Republic was founded in 508, the others in 3508, before Christ." Let us conclude our remarks upon the antiquity of the Egyptians with an observation of the Abbé Vigouroux: "We must acknowledge that Egypt existed before the time of Menes, and that it is notably more ancient. Go back as far as we will in its history, we find it in a state of advanced civilization, in possession of the arts, of inscriptive monuments, and of religion. . . . But here, as in questions of prehistoric paleontology and archæology, we lack chronometers, we can arrive at no certain conclusions, and we must only repeat that

Genesis, correctly understood, leaves the Egyptologist perfectly free to claim for Egypt the antiquity which a careful study of its monuments indicates."

2. INDIA.—"The Hindoos," says Kruse, "have no historical works. They have wrapped ancient events in a poetical cloak of myths, without any attempt at chronology." Duncker assures us that we can have no certain knowledge of them prior to the year 800 before the Christian era.[1] In the country itself no historical monument dating farther back than the third century before the Christian era has been found. Xavier Raymond tells us in his history of India that "the fragments which remain of the annals of the people of India are so mingled with fable and disfigured by the most extravagant chronology that it is impossible for the most patient investigator to find a thread to guide him in the perplexing labyrinth. We find no certain date in the history of the country before the invasion of Alexander (327–325 B.C.)." Finally, Bournouf assures us that "it requires an act of faith to believe that the literature of India is ancient; for among their numerous works no historical books have yet been found." If Sanscrit literature permits us to go farther back than history proper, it furnishes no satisfactory data in regard to the antiquity of man. According to Max Müller, the most ancient hymns of the Vedas date no farther back than the year 1200 before Christ. Hence Barthélemy St. Hilaire concludes that, "despite all the efforts of our profound and careful study, we must despair of resurrecting a past annihilated by the very actors in this past. India has not willed to come forth from her dreams; we cannot evoke her historically from the tomb."

3. CHINA.—Notwithstanding the earnest efforts not only of the present but of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to unravel the chronology of China, we have almost as little knowledge of its early history as of India. Nor is this remarkable: in fact the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire

[1] See Chatard, essay 24.

in primitive ages had no era, properly speaking, and preserved no historic records; later, about the year 213 before Christ, Chihouang-ti, the founder of the Tsin dynasty, ordered all the historical books of the kingdom to be destroyed under penalty of death. In addition to this, ancient monuments, with which we might verify or modify dates, are totally wanting. Those that have been brought forward do not bear critical examination. Thus Balfour justly remarks: "The primitive history of the Middle Kingdom is a sealed book." The knowledge we have of it indicates that the chronology derived from the Septuagint is sufficient for the development of its history.

4. CHALDEA.—The ancient monuments recently discovered in Chaldea give us a better knowledge of its chronology. The historic records of the country throw but little light upon it; all that relates to chronology in the fragments of Berosus, priest of Bel at Babylon, was regarded as fabulous even by the Greeks. It is quite otherwise with the cuneiform inscriptions: they furnish us with more precise dates in regard to Chaldea and Babylon, starting from the era of Nabonassar, 747 before Christ. If, however, these dates are correct, the chronology derived from the Septuagint is insufficient, and we must admit that there are gaps and omissions in biblical chronology. But what means have we of verifying the accuracy of these dates?

CONCLUSION.—"The history of India, and even that of China in its authentic parts," concludes the Abbé Vigouroux, "may easily be included in the series of centuries admitted by the Greek and Latin Fathers. As to Egypt, the extreme antiquity of Menes is by no means proved, and there is much evidence tending to diminish it. It may be argued, it is true, that the state of civilization in Egypt during the reign of the most ancient kings known to us indicates, as do also geological and paleontological discoveries, a longer period of time than that furnished by the Septuagint. But no fixed or absolute calculation is possible here, hence we can only

repeat to scholars: Establish the antiquity of man with solid proofs, and the Bible will not contradict you."

V. The Bible and Modern Discoveries in Egypt and Assyria.[1]

We cannot terminate these notes upon the relations between the Bible and science without speaking of the unexpected testimony borne to the truth of the Holy Scriptures by the modern discoveries made in Egypt, Chaldea, and Assyria. The inhabitants of these countries are the people who had most intercourse with the Hebrews. The Hebrews, the Assyrians, and the Chaldeans had a common origin; for centuries they trod the same soil, lived the same life, followed the same customs. They were brought again into immediate relations when the Israelites were led into exile by Nabuchodonosor.

As to Egypt, it is well known that the Jews dwelt there for several centuries. Hence it was not possible to exhume these people from the tomb, so to speak, without casting light upon the facts consigned to Scripture. It was truly providential that at the very moment when rationalism was inventing new weapons with which to sap the foundations of the divine work, God caused the Chaldeans and the Egyptians to live again to attest and proclaim the veracity of Moses and the sacred writers.

1. Discoveries in Egypt.—We know that Napoleon I. took with him in his expedition to Egypt a galaxy of scholars to gather all that was possible in the interest of science. He made important discoveries; they became innumerable from the time that the indefatigable Champollion succeeded in deciphering the hieroglyphics. As we cannot dwell upon these important discoveries which followed without interruption, let us content ourselves with giving an idea of the real service they rendered Holy Scripture.

[1] Thebaud, Gentilism; Brown; Thein, ch. 10; A. C. Q. iii. 73, xvi. 703; M. lxxiv. 528; C. W. xiii. 804, xiv. 63.

We all know, for example, the history of Abraham and that of Joseph, and that they contain innumerable details relating to the morals, customs, geography, etc., of the time. It was these details which formed the subject of the attacks of German rationalists, which were afterwards translated or copied by the free-thinkers of France. They alleged that the biblical accounts contained numerous inaccuracies and errors, denoting a writer very imperfectly acquainted with the country he described, and, above all, possessing no claim to the divine inspiration that we attribute to him.

First. The manner of Abraham's reception at the court of Pharao seemed very improbable. They also claimed that the sheep, asses, and particularly camels offered by the king of Egypt to the patriarch were animals which had never been acclimated in this country; that horses, on the contrary, which were not enumerated among the presents of Pharao, were numerous there. Objections of a like nature were raised against the history of Joseph. The incident of the cup presented to the king by the cupbearer was absurd; wine, they insisted, was almost unknown in Egypt; the ceremony of clothing Joseph in a robe of silk, as well as the chain of gold and the graven stone bestowed upon him when he was raised to the dignity of prime minister, were unknown at that period.

Now, in the midst of this general assault upon the Bible, the modern discoveries of Egyptologists gave the most positive denial to these arrogant claims of an impious science, and completely destroyed this scientific scaffolding so laboriously erected. The numerous paintings in the hypogea of Beni-Hussan, contemporaneous with Abraham, represented scenes from the reception of strangers recalling, incident for incident, the visit of Abraham to Pharao. According to the inscriptions on the paintings, the strangers, like the members of the family of the patriarch, were *amu*, that is, wandering shepherds of Arabia and Palestine; the name of their chief, Abschah (father of the sand), bears

some analogy to that of Abraham (father of the multitude); the physiognomy and the costumes are purely Semitic. Though the amu offer presents as a mark of submission and respect, they are treated as persons of distinction; the reception tendered them is accompanied with all the pomp of the Egyptian ceremonial. Finally, everything, even to the motive of the visit, seems to be identical: it was a famine, says the hieroglyphic legend, which attracted these strangers to the land of Misraim.

The sculptures and the paintings of Thebes, explained by the most accurate authentic texts, show that asses (aa), sheep (sau), and oxen (aûa) formed the greater part of the riches of kings and princes; some of the monuments also represent *camels; horses*, on the contrary, do not figure among the animals, and the inscriptions tell us that they were acclimated in Egypt only under the reign of the shepherd-kings, under the last of whom Joseph was prime minister. Hence it is natural that they should not be mentioned in the twelfth dynasty, the period when Abraham went to Egypt.

As to the history of Joseph, indirect proofs of its authenticity are no less numerous or less conclusive. Wine was perfectly well known among the ancient Egyptians. Artists of Thebes represent the ancient inhabitants of the Nile cultivating the vine, using and abusing wine, and receiving at their repasts the wine-cup from the hands of the first cup-bearer.

Several centuries before the arrival of Joseph the Egyptians were already the best goldsmiths and engravers in the world. Jewels and engraved stones, veritable masterpieces in every respect, wrought in Egyptian manufactories more than three thousand years ago, may be counted by hundreds. All the museums of Europe have a large number of magnificent specimens. Moreover, the description given by Moses of the ceremony of Joseph's elevation to the rank of prime minister, the putting a robe of silk upon him,

a chain of gold upon his neck, a ring upon his finger, the official title which the king gave him, and the place assigned him in the second chariot in the royal processions—all this is a faithful copy of the numerous sculptures and paintings representing the same facts.

And so it is with the account of the dreams of the cupbearer and the baker, of the interview of the sons of Jacob with Joseph, of the special etiquette observed at the feast which was served them. But without entering into details, which we could multiply indefinitely, and all of which prove the accuracy of Moses even in the smallest particulars, let us consider only a recent discovery connected with the last years of the Hebrews' sojourn in Egypt, which furnishes the biblical exegete authentic and unexpected information.

A mummy recently discovered in a state of preservation proved to be Ramses II., the Greek Sesostris, who inaugurated the persecution of the Hebrews. To satisfy his mania for building as well as his hatred of the sons of Israel he forced them to build the two cities in the land of Gessen, Rameses and Pithom. The Bible gives us a picture of the sufferings of Israel; under the rod of the Egyptian overseers the Hebrews were forced to labor without respite, making bricks and baking them in the sun. The pictures of the eighteenth dynasty confirm the accuracy of the biblical account in every point; even the mode of manufacturing the brick described in the papyrus containing the reports of the overseers is identical with that given in the Bible.

But the location of the two cities built by the Hebrews was unknown; the texts gave only a vague description of Rameses; Pithom was commemorated in no monument so far discovered. Behold, this last village has risen out of the sand which so long covered its vast ruins.

In the month of February, 1883, Naville discovered near Maskhuta, east of the Delta, an immense block of granite representing a Pharao seated between the god Ra and the god Tum. This Pharao was no other than the

Ramses II. whose name occurs six times in the inscription of the monument. The ruins in which the Swiss Egyptologist found the sculpture were composed of a mass of sun-baked brick mixed with straw and reeds, and stamped with the cartouche of Ramses. They were surrounded by a good-sized wall, also of brick, enclosing an area of a hundred acres. Other sculptures soon came to light, all bearing, with the biblical name of Pithom, the cartouche of Pharao the persecutor. No fragment anterior to this reign was found.

This important discovery, while confirming the truth of the Mosaic text, enables us also to determine with sufficient satisfaction the limits of the land of Gessen, and to trace with greater precision the route of the Exodus.

This accuracy of local coloring has become so manifest that the most hostile savants, finding themselves everywhere contradicted by new discoveries, are forced to acknowledge themselves defeated.[1] Thus when, in 1868, Ebers, the most celebrated Egyptologist of Germany, published, despite the protestations of fellow rationalists, his first volume on Egypt and the books of Moses, the evidence of facts forced from him this significant avowal: "It is with reluctance that I publish this laborious work. I hope no doubt to win with it the good-will of a certain number of biblical adherents, but, on the other hand, I am well aware that I shall subject myself to severe criticism. I offer despite myself, so to speak, and yet willingly, to those who would close the Scriptures to open criticism, much which will gratify them, for I demonstrate that the history of Joseph particularly, even in the smallest details, portrays with great exactness the state of ancient Egypt."

2. Discoveries in Assyria and Chaldea.—Notwithstanding the amount and variety of information furnished by ancient Egyptian monuments, Egyptology has not fulfilled all that it promised at the beginning. It has hardly given us more than merely *indirect* confirmation of the

[1] A. E. R., Nov. 1902.

truth of the Sacred Scriptures. With Assyrian archæology the results are quite otherwise: here direct proofs are most numerous. The texts and sculptures of the ruins of Ninive and Babylon not only confirm the inspired writings, but in many places explain them and supply omissions.[1]

About the time that the key to the hieroglyphic writing was discovered scholars began to decipher cuneiform writing, that is, the wedge- or nail-shaped inscriptions: the triangular steel used in forming the characters produced a mark resembling a wedge or nail. The monuments of Assyria were covered with this writing; the Assyrian monarchs were in the habit of engraving their exploits on tablets, prisms, or cylinders, which were placed in the foundations of large edifices, on the marbles which adorned the large halls of the temples and palaces, or behind the basreliefs which ornamented the porticos. The richest source of it, however, consists of the numerous libraries discovered in Chaldea, Assyria, and particularly at Ninive. In this city was discovered, besides the library of the palace of Sennacherib, that of the palace of Assurbanipal, containing about ten thousand cuneiform tablets, that is, an almost complete treasury of the literature of the period: theology, astronomy or astrology, history political and natural, geography, and grammar. The books of the libraries consisted of flat, square tablets of clay, covered on both sides with fine, closely written cuneiform characters, which were set by a process of baking or firing. Some of the books consisted of more than a hundred tablets, labelled and numbered in the most perfect order. It is true that the library, particularly of Assurbanipal, was seriously injured in the palace fire and, later, by the inclemency of the seasons and the rapacity of the Arabs; but a good portion of it still remains and forms one of the chief possessions of the British Museum in London.

We are indebted for these treasures to the efforts of Mr.

[1] See Rogers, History of Babylonia.

Layard in 1850, and to those of Mr. George Smith in 1873 and 1875. In the beginning of April, 1882, Hormuzd Rassam enriched the British Museum with five thousand new tablets which he found at Abou-Habba, the Sipharnaïm of the Bible. The Louvre also acquired in 1882 a large collection of cuneiform inscriptions. At the same time M. de Sarzec, French consul at Bassorah, discovered at a four days' journey from this locality ruins covering a space of from six to seven kilometres, and containing a large number of cylinders and tablets as well as the remains of a temple formerly ornamented with greenstone statues of great antiquity. These figures are the first specimens of real Chaldean statuary.

Here are a few of the remarkable results of Chaldean-Assyrian discoveries relating to biblical exegesis.

The Assyrian bas-reliefs frequently reproduce the tree of life; an ancient Babylonian cylinder represents the temptation of Adam and Eve; the serpent, which is seen behind the woman, does not crawl, but stands erect. Mr. George Smith found a cuneiform tablet anterior to Moses, on which were inscribed all the principal events of the deluge: the corruption of the world; the divine command to build the ark; the judgment of God against sinners; the dimensions of the ark, the calking, the command to preserve certain living creatures; the entrance into the ark; the description of the deluge; the opening of the window; the sending forth of the bird; the oblation of sacrifice; the blessing of God and the covenant with Him. Another account of the same event has just been discovered by M. Hormuzd Rassam. This version is not of Assyrian origin like the first, but Chaldean, yet it is exactly the same and supplies several omissions.

Shapeless ruins, 170 metres in circumference and 46 in height, were found recently twelve miles from Hillah, an ancient town of Babylon; they consisted of bricks partially vitrified by fire, and have proved to be the remains of

Birs-Nimrud. The labors of Mr. Oppert establish beyond doubt that they are the ruins of the Tower of Babel. The inscriptions of Sargon, on the other hand, tell us the material employed in its construction: bricks baked in the fire, and slime for mortar. Is not this precisely what the Bible says? "When they removed from the East, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar, and dwelt in it. And each one said to his neighbor: Come, let us make bricks, and bake them with fire. And they had bricks instead of stones, and slime instead of mortar." (Gen. xi. 3.)

The Babylonian traditions of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues are so strikingly like the biblical report that certain modern rationalists have thought that the legend "could not be very old." But in his inscriptions Nabuchodonosor, who rebuilt the monument, speaks of the first tower "as of great antiquity."

By reading, with the light of Assyrian discoveries, the books of the Old Testament where the people of God come before us in their relations with the kings of Ninive and Babylon, we shall also find numerous and incontestable proofs of biblical truth; but we can give only a few instances. The enemies of the Bible question the Babylonian captivity of Manasses, king of Juda, mentioned in the Book of Chronicles, and the historic existence of Sargon, king of Assyria, mentioned by Isaias. Thanks to recent discoveries made by Assyriologists, such doubts can no longer be entertained. As regards Sargon, for instance, they have produced inscriptions sufficiently developed to be called by Assyriologists "The Fasti of Sargon." Moreover, an effigy of the great monarch himself is now to be seen at the Louvre in Paris.

The Book of Daniel, says the Assyrian scholar Menant, records the features of the Chaldean civilization under King Nabuchodonosor with an exactness which an apocryphal or fraudulent writer could never have attained.

It was also stated that the Book of Esther was written

in the year 160 B.C., after the victories of Judas Machabeus, by a writer absolutely ignorant of Persia. Now the excavations made by Dieulafoy give the lie to all such statements. In a conference which he gave in 1888, a résumé of which was given by M. Darmesteter in the *Journal asiatique*, he showed that "the objections accumulated by a rationalistic exegesis against the authenticity of the Bible are based chiefly on an imperfect conception of Persian life. The details which were condemned as unreasonable and improbable now prove, on the contrary, that the writer possessed an excellent knowledge of the customs of the court of Susa." It is only necessary to examine the plan of the royal palace brought to light by the excavations of M. Dieulafoy to see how accurate are certain details of the edifice given by the author of the Book of Esther. The writer's description is evidently based upon an actual view of this monument, destroyed at the end of the third century B.C.

The study of the Egyptian and Assyrian languages, compared with the text of the Bible, also affords proofs in favor of Scripture quite as conclusive as those of archæological discoveries. We find in the Pentateuch, and there only, a large number of Egyptian words, which prove how familiar its author was with the Egyptian language. The tradition which attributes the work to Moses is all that satisfactorily explains this phenomenon. Let us give a few examples.

PENTATEUCH.	EGYPTIAN.
Têbâh (the basket in which Moses was exposed on the Nile)	Tba.
Ses (the linen robe of Joseph, the prime minister)	Ses.
Hartum (Pharao's interpreters)	Hartum.
Qas (straw used in the bricks)	Qas.
Seneh (the burning bush)	Sent.

Even the accuracy of the proper names in the Bible is confirmed by the contemporary monuments of Assyria and

Egypt. This is the more remarkable that the Bible is the only book which transmits the original orthography of these proper names; in all other books extra-biblical, even the most ancient, it is frequently impossible to identify them.

Biblical Names.	Cuneiform or Hieroglyphic Texts.
Madai (Media)	Madai
Javan (Ionia)	Javanu.
Kus (Ethiopia)	Kuschi. Kus.
Put (Syria)	Put.
Nemrod	Nemerad.
Babel (Confusion)	Babel.
Jerusalem	Oursalimmi.
Sennacherib	Sin-Akhi-irib.
Manasses	Minasi.
Pharao	Per-aa.
Putiphar	Petiphra.
Abram	Abram or Abu-Rama (Assyrian form), great father.
Chanaan	Kanana.
Accad (city of Sennaar)	Akkad.
Assur, Elam, Aram (Children of Sem)	Assur. Ilam. Aramu.

The lists of the names of countries in the inscriptions of Thothmes III. at Karnak contain a large number of cities and localities mentioned in the Bible.

We should never conclude if we were to mention all the testimony which modern discoveries in Egypt, Assyria, and Palestine bear to the absolute truth of the Scriptures.

Conclusion.—We cannot better conclude this part of our work relating to the authority of the Pentateuch than by quoting a beautiful page from the Abbé Darras' "History of the Church," vol. III.: "Will these frequent discomfitures of in-

credulous exegetes make future rationalists more cautious? Would we might hope so! But as we glance at the past and count all the adversaries of the Scriptures who have successively come forward to hurl their grain of sand against the immutable rock of the divine word, we have told ourselves that these revolts of the human mind will never cease. Hence, despite so many impotent efforts other arms will be raised again; despite so many failures, other assailants will rise in their turn; the struggle will last until the end of time. But God, who reserved for our day witnesses buried in oblivion for more than three thousand years, will raise up others in ages to come. What rich harvests, still unknown, are to be reaped in the domain of the past! What treasures, now buried under the ruins of extinct civilizations, the future will see exhumed at the hour marked for the triumph of truth and biblical faith!

"Even in our own day have we not found that every discovery so laboriously accomplished in all the branches of human science is a most striking and unexpected confirmation of the most widely controverted texts of Sacred Scripture? And so it has been from the time of Porphyrius to the present day. Now let the most perfect work of genius be submitted to the investigation, to the severe and partial criticism which the Bible has endured, and that for centuries; where is the Plato, the Aristotle, the Tacitus, the Bossuet of whom one single work would remain entire? And yet the Bible stands triumphant and immortal. According as devastating hands dig about the foundations of the edifice to destroy it, they find new and ever-indestructible masonry supporting it.

"Rationalists, you do not believe in miracles; for twenty centuries you have followed one another in legions to destroy a book written long ago by a few Hebrews in a small province of Asia. All human passions have been allied with you in this war. So many books have been destroyed, and yet you could not destroy this one: in truth it is a miracle."

ART. III.—AUTHORITY OF THE GOSPELS.[1]

Universal credence would be willingly given to our inspired books if, instead of the life of the Saviour and the establishment of Christianity, they told us of the deeds and exploits of a great conqueror or of one of those political revolutions upsetting whole nations. But they acquaint us with the origin of a religion which demands the sacrifice of many prejudices and passions and the constant practice of precepts opposed to the worst instincts of nature. Hence it is not surprising that every effort has been made to destroy this religion. Now the very foundation of Christianity will be shattered if the quality of historical certainty can be removed from those documents which record the life, miracles, death, and resurrection of Christ and the founding of the Church. It is, therefore, of capital importance to establish upon solid grounds the historical authority of these documents already so venerable by their age.

Let us recall what we have already said in regard to the point of view from which we are considering the Holy Scriptures, and the qualities required to render the authority of a historical document full and complete.

I. Authenticity.

The authenticity of the writings of the New Testament, upon which the full light of criticism has been concentrated, is now hardly disputed. Reus, Holzman, Schenkel, Reville, Michel Nicolas recognize the historical authority of the gospels and admit that they were written in the first century of the Christian era. "We consider ourselves justified," says Tischendorf, "in placing at the end of the first century not the birth or composition of the gospels, but their union into a canonical body of books." In regard to the epistles

[1] Introductions by Breen, Dixon, McDevitt, Gigot, Burnet, Why, etc., ch. 15–19; D. R., Apr. '93, p. 420, New Ser. xxiv. 357; C. W. xlviii. 376, lvii. 593; M., Sept., Oct. '84, Jan. '85.

of St. Paul Renan affirms that the full light of history shines upon the time of St. Paul's preaching, which, without doubt, was between the fifteenth and the thirty-second year after the Passion of Jesus. He says: "The epistles of this apostle have an absolute authenticity." Again: "It is beyond all doubt that the Acts were written by the author of the third gospel, of which they are a continuation. . . . The author is a companion of St. Paul."

Thesis.—The Gospels were Written in the First Century of the Christian Era, by the Authors whose Names they Bear, that is, by the Apostles or their Immediate Disciples.

First Argument.—It is *prescription.* Possession is equal to a title until the claim is disproved. Now all Christians, Catholic or heretical, have always regarded, and still regard, the gospels as authentic, and on this point they are in *peaceful* and *perpetual possession.* To dispossess them it is necessary to prove that the possession is illegal, and to say when and by whom the assumption was made. "We Christians," says M. de Broglie, "are in the position of a proprietor who knows from whom he holds his possessions, who is sure of the validity of his title, and who is obliged to examine the claims of contestants only as far as it is necessary to defend his own." Now, despite all the efforts of infidelity, we find no opposition on this capital point, except a few weak objections, the futility of which we shall see later on. The authenticity of the gospels, therefore, remains established until its adversaries prove the contrary. But this they cannot do, for the proofs which we are about to demonstrate are irrefutable.

Second Argument.—The *positive proofs* in favor of this authenticity are so numerous and so uniform that they defy contradiction. We have, in fact, on this point:

a. The unanimous accord of *all Christian authors,* not only of our day, but even of the first centuries. Among the Apostolic Fathers, that is, the immediate disciples of the

apostles, we find quotations from the gospels.[1] St. Ignatius of Antioch, the disciple of St. John, says in one of his letters (ad Philad. 2, 5): "I have recourse to the Gospel as to Christ corporally present, and to the apostles [that is, to the epistles] as to the teaching of the present Church." St. Papias, another disciple of St. John, gives precise information in regard to the writings of St. Matthew and St. Mark, whom he designates by name. In the second century St. Justin testifies that in his time the memoirs of the apostles, which we call gospels, were read in the assemblies of the Christians; he knows that these memoirs were written by the apostles and apostolic men (that is, by the apostles Matthew and John, and by apostolic men, Mark and Luke). The first to cite the names of the four evangelists is St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, St. John's disciple; he came from Asia Minor to Gaul and was raised to the episcopal see of Lyons, where he died a martyr in 202. In his works he refers so frequently to the gospels that we could almost reconstruct the entire gospel narrative with the texts he quotes. He has left an analysis of the Gospel of St. Luke corresponding point for point with the book we possess bearing this name. Origen, in Egypt, and Tertullian, in Africa, afford us formal and almost equally ancient testimony in favor of the authenticity of the gospels.[2]

b. The accord of the *heretics* of the early centuries. The Gnostics knew our gospels and made frequent use of them. Marcion falsified the Gospel of St. Luke to adapt it to his

[1] We have a certain number of writings of the Apostolic Fathers which are absolutely and incontestably authentic. Such are the celebrated letter to the Corinthians by St. Clement, a contemporary of St. Peter; the Epistle of Barnabas, the faithful companion and friend of St. Paul; The Pastor by Hermas; seven letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch; the letter of St. Polycarp to the Philippians; the letter to Diognetes; and the Fragments of Papias.

[2] I. E. R., Apr., May, July 1900. In Père Didon's beautiful work, Jesus Christ, another proof is taken from the different *versions* of the gospels put forth in the very earliest days of Christianity (pp. xii., xxvii., Engl. ed.).

erroneous doctrines. In fact the authenticity of the gospels was so incontestable that none of these heretics dreamed of disputing it.

c. The agreement of *pagans* themselves, such as Celsus in the second century, Porphyrius in the third, Julian the Apostate in the fourth. These inveterate and astute enemies of the Christian religion tried, it is true, to find in the gospels objections to their divinity, but they never attempted to assail the authenticity of the books. Yet if it had been possible they certainly would have had recourse to this means, for it was evidently the shortest and most efficacious way of combating the Church of Christ.

THIRD ARGUMENT.—The gospels bear all the intrinsic marks of authenticity. So far from finding in them anything contrary to the laws, usages, institutions, language, customs, characters, tastes, prejudices, in a word, to the social and religious state of Judea at that time, it is portrayed with such scrupulous accuracy and precise detail that only ocular witnesses could have known and written the events described. The same may be said of all that relates to the history, the geography, the topography, the numismatics of the period. The English writers Lardner and Paley, particularly, have demonstrated that the conformity of the gospels to the state of Roman society as we know it in the time of Augustus is, even in the smallest details, most remarkable. Now it would have been absolutely impossible for a later writer not to err, particularly upon certain very complicated and obscure points of the first century. It is evident from a number of passages that the Jews to whom St. Matthew addresses his gospel lived in Jerusalem before its ruin. The Jerusalem of Agrippa is so vividly portrayed in the same gospel that rationalists do not venture to date its composition beyond the years immediately following the destruction of the holy city; otherwise how could the vanished city have left so fresh a memory? When these critics, obstinate enemies of the Holy Scriptures, place

the composition of the first gospel after the year 70, it is only because it contains the prophecy of the ruin of Jerusalem and of the Temple: from their standpoint prophecy being impossible, they must declare it to have been written after the event.

Fourth Argument.—The preceding proofs more than suffice to establish decisively the authenticity of the gospels. We may go still further, however, and demonstrate that it is even impossible for these books to be other than authentic. In fact the proofs cited above show that they were universally recognized as authentic at the beginning of the second and even in the first century. If, therefore, there was any imposture, it must necessarily have been perpetrated in the lifetime of the apostles, or a short time after their death. These two hypotheses are equally inadmissible, for anything of the kind would have encountered violent opposition from the apostles, so careful to preserve the faith in all its purity, or at least from their immediate disciples, as well as from pagans and heretics interested in revealing the imposture. Now nothing of the kind was produced. The faithful never hesitated to receive these writings as coming from the apostles; on the contrary, when the apocryphal gospels appeared they were immediately repudiated by the most eminent Christian doctors.

Conclusion.—These arguments, as convincing and decisive as history can possibly furnish, render the authenticity of the gospels incontestable. Renan himself is finally forced by German science to acknowledge as much. "On the whole," he says, "I admit that the four canonical gospels are authentic. In my opinion they all date from the first century and they are *nearly all* written by the authors to whom they are attributed." *Nearly all*—rather a strange expression in a question requiring a simple yes or no. But some allowance must be made for the awkward constraint of such an acknowledgment.[1]

[1] See the Abbé Fouard's work, "St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity," ch. 12; also Didon, l. c.

II. Integrity of the Gospels.

First Argument.—To prove this integrity we may be satisfied with quoting the following from the learned polyglot Card. Wiseman: "Although every attainable source has been exhausted; although the Fathers of every age have gleaned for their readings; although the versions of every nation, Arabic, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian, have been ransacked for their renderings; although manuscripts of every age from the sixteenth upwards to the third, and of every country, have been again and again visited by industrious swarms to rifle them of their treasures; although, having exhausted the stores of the West, critics have travelled like naturalists into distant lands to discover new specimens—have visited, like Scholz or Sebastiani, the recesses of Mount Athos, or the unexplored libraries of the Egyptian and Syrian deserts—yet nothing has been discovered, no, not one single various reading, which can throw doubt upon any passage before considered certain or decisive in favor of any important doctrine." [1]

We have about five hundred ancient MSS. of the gospels, dating from the time of Constantine to the sixteenth century; the principal are the Codex Vaticanus, the Alexandrine, the palimpsest of St. Ephrem in the National Library of Paris, and the Codex Sinaiticus. Now all these MSS., even the most ancient, substantially agree. They agree also with the numerous quotations made by the Fathers and the Doctors of the Church. Therefore they have remained as they were originally written.

We have seen that the result of the studies made concerning the MSS. of the Old Testament is absolutely the same; hence the enemies of Christianity are forced to acknowledge their defeat.

Second Argument.—Such alteration, moreover, would have been impossible in books so widely known and re-

[1] Science and Rev. Rel., l. 10.

spected from the beginning. In fact, when could it have taken place? In the time of the apostles? They would not have permitted it. After their death? Their disciples would have perceived it and would have protested against it. A little later? The copies of these writings were so numerous and such a great check one upon the other that any alteration would have excited violent protest on the part of the Christians, on the part of heretics, or, finally, on the part of Jews and pagans. Now nothing of the kind took place. "At the present day," says August Nicolas, "it would be impossible to alter the Holy Scriptures, for they are in the hands of all Catholics, of the pope, bishops, priests and laity; they are in the hands of heretics and Jews; they are in the hands of unbelievers: and one or other of these would be sure to brand the imposture as soon as it appeared. Now what is impossible to-day, because of this triple rank of incorruptible surveillants, has always been impossible for the same reason."

OBSERVATION.—No doubt numerous *variants* are found in the different MSS. of the New Testament, but they prove absolutely nothing against the integrity of the book. We know that the same thing occurs and must occur in all the works which have come down to us from antiquity. The variants in the works of Horace alone have furnished matter for three volumes. There could not but be variants in the gospels, for no work has been, at all times and in all places, more copied, read, translated, and commentated. God was not obliged to work a perpetual and striking miracle to preserve the gospels from slight changes in the text which in no way affected the doctrine. We may even say that these numerous variants, far from proving anything against the integrity of the Holy Scriptures, only confirm it the more. As they leave the essential parts of each phrase intact, it is clear that they are only the mistakes of copyists and translators, and that the idea of a substantial alteration never occurred to any one.

CONCLUSION.—The evangelical books have never been altered; it was not even possible to alter them. The fact of their integrity, therefore, is incontestable.

III. TRUTHFULNESS OF THE GOSPELS.

Let us prove now that the authors of the gospels (*a*) could not be deceived in regard to the events which they relate; (*b*) that they did not wish to deceive; (*c*) that even had they wished to deceive they could not do so; and we shall thus establish the incontestable accuracy of their narrations.

A. THESE WRITERS COULD NOT BE DECEIVED, for they relate only what they saw or learned from eye-witnesses worthy of belief. They wrote, moreover, of sensible, material, recent facts accomplished in the full light of day, frequently in the presence of a large multitude, and even of the enemies of Jesus, who, without contesting what He did, endeavored only to explain it by means of the intervention of the Evil One. They were facts of capital importance to the institutions and the religion of the Jewish people, and consequently of vital interest to them; finally, they were frequently extraordinary and marvellous, and therefore fitted to excite attention. We certainly cannot say that the authors of the gospels were, all four at the same time, blind and deaf or the victims of illusion. If we did, we should have to say the same of innumerable others, even among the enemies of Jesus, for they also admitted, without protest, the evangelical narratives. It is certain, therefore, that these writers could not have been deceived in regard to what they have written.

B. DID THEY WISH TO DECEIVE?—This is impossible, for they had no object in playing so base a rôle; now a man must have some reason for making himself an impostor. Far from hoping to derive any advantage from a fraud which would have been attacked by Jews as well as by pagans, they could only expect what they actually reaped: contempt, outrages, persecution, and, finally, to be put to death. It is well known that they sealed their testimony with their blood.

Pascal had reason to say: "I readily believe the histories of witnesses who sealed their testimony with their death." Moreover, we have only to read the gospels without prejudice to be convinced that these historians could not be impostors: the sincere, simple, candid tone of the narratives is a guarantee of their veracity.

C. They could Not Deceive.—1st. They wrote the gospels while numerous witnesses of the events related in them still lived who would not have failed to brand any falsification. The Jews, particularly, had the greatest interest in doing so. The chiefs of the synagogue, unable to deny the facts, endeavored to suppress the new religion by silencing the apostles, but they found it impossible to dispute the truth of the gospel narratives. There was question of public events of the greatest importance; they were related as occurring throughout Judea and in the very city of Jerusalem, in the presence of numerous witnesses mentioned by name. Many who figured in the events were men of high positions, inimical to Jesus, and interested in revealing the existence of fraud; hence, if protestations had been possible, they would have been loud and violent. Yet not a voice was raised to confound these impostors! Such an hypothesis is manifestly absurd.

2d. One who claims that the writings of the New Testament are inventions must admit the following absurdities:

a. A few unlettered, uneducated fishermen imagined a hero of so grand a character and so pure a life that he forces from J. J. Rousseau this spontaneous tribute of admiration: "Yes, if the life and death of Socrates are those of a wise man, the life and death of Jesus are those of a God." These same ignorant men invented and attributed to their hero a doctrine holier, more sublime, more profound than all that the most celebrated pagan philosophers have ever conceived. "To invent a Newton," says Parker, "one would have to be a Newton himself. What man could invent a person like Jesus? Jesus alone could do it."

b. These writers, contrary to the manner of impostors, enter into the smallest details of time, of place, of persons, and yet there is throughout a perfect resemblance, an absolute conformity to all that we know of that period exposed to the full light of history.

c. These men, as ignorant as they were corrupt, wrote these fables of their imagination in a style of truly inimitable candor and simplicity. The accent of truth in all these pages from various pens is so striking that it carries conviction to every unbiassed mind, and forces the same Rousseau to exclaim: "Shall we say that the history of the Gospel is invented at will? My friend, this is not the way inventions are made; and the facts in the life of Socrates are not as well attested as those in the life of Jesus Christ. This, in reality, is abandoning the difficulty instead of solving it; it would be easier to conceive that four men agreed to manufacture this book than that one alone furnished the subject of it. Never could Jewish authors have found either this tone or this morality; the Gospel bears characters of truth so great, so striking, so inimitable, that its inventor would be more marvellous than its hero."

d. The various writers of the gospels, the Acts, and the epistles, though separated by distance and years, agree so perfectly in their imaginary narratives, presented in very different forms, that no real contradiction can be proved among them. As to the discrepancies and apparent contradictions in the narrations of the four evangelists, they are a proof that they did not concert to invent what they relate.

e. All these writers, uninfluenced by any interest temporal or eternal, sealed with their blood what they knew to be an invention on their part, and after them millions of martyrs died to attest the same lie.

f. These same men, who could have been only base impostors, succeeded, without any human assistance, in establishing their fraud so perfectly as to overthrow not only

Judaism, so ancient and so deeply rooted, but also paganism, bulwarked by wealth, science, power, and a moral code favoring human passions; they succeeded in making the repentant world kneel at the feet of a crucified criminal; succeeded in leading an immense number of men to renounce all they had till then believed and practised, and to adopt a religion offering to the mind unfathomable mysteries, and to the will a moral law contrary to all the instincts of sensual nature.

g. A religion which has regenerated humanity, created the modern world on the ruins of the old, inspired its morality, its institutions, its laws; which has been everywhere an inexhaustible source of truth, of virtues, and of blessings; which counts among its disciples in all ages innumerable scholars and saints, could not have been founded upon a lie invented by a few fishermen.

h. Finally, God must have confirmed the fraud of these impostors by fulfilling the prophecies which they invented and attributed to Jesus, and by working innumerable miracles in the course of ages in favor of their disciples; hence He contributed to lead us into error.

In truth, if this is the case, we have reason to say with Richard of St. Victor. "Lord, if I am in error it is Thou who hast deceived me, for the Christian religion is confirmed by signs so striking and so numerous that Thou alone canst be its author."

Résumé and Conclusion.—Let us quote here, by way of résumé, a beautiful page from M. de Broglie's *L'Église et l'Empire Romain au IV^e^ Siècle:* "The events related in the Bible do not belong, like the records of ancient religions, to a remote, semi-heroic, and semi-barbaric age, nor are they confined to some unknown, deserted land. It was in the bosom of advanced civilization, in the principal city of a Roman province, visited by Pompey and described by Tacitus, that Jesus Christ lived, preached, established His Church, and sacrificed His life. His biography has not

come down to us from mouth to mouth in rhapsodies heightened by popular enthusiasm and credulity. Four simple, precise narratives, agreeing in their assertions, taken down by ocular or contemporaneous witnesses in a perfectly intelligible language, are the documents upon which the history of Jesus Christ is established. A concert of ancient testimony, a prompt diffusion, the similarity of the texts spread throughout the entire world, the conformity of the narratives to contemporaneous chronology, constitute characters which in their turn entitle the evangelic writings to rank among the authentic monuments of the past. The authenticity of the facts rests upon no other foundation; criticism can exact nothing more. We know Jesus Christ through His disciples John and Matthew, St. Paul through Luke, the companion of his travels. Have we any other knowledge of Alexander or Augustus than that furnished us by their companions in arms or their courtiers? Because facts belong to the domain of faith and astonish reason, because they carry with them a certain order of moral consequences, is this any reason for rejecting, in regard to them, all the ordinary rules of human judgment? We ask no other favor for the Gospel than that of being judged by the usual tests applied by science and erudition." M. de Wallon remarks in his turn, at the conclusion of his beautiful work, *La Croyance due à l'Évangile:* "If we were as exacting and as critical in regard to ancient or modern books as we are in regard to the New Testament, history would still be unwritten, for want of duly authenticated records; we should be still in the mythological age." [1]

IV. Answers to Objections.

A. General Reply.—We cannot enter into detail here in regard to all the objections which adversaries have been pleased to collect against the veracity of the gospels. More-

[1] Lacordaire, 6th conf. on Jesus Christ.

over, the solid character of our thesis does not require this special refutation, particularly as we are treating the question of the veracity of the Scriptures only from an historical point of view. Therefore we shall confine ourselves to the following reflections, which we have borrowed also from M. de Broglie.

All the objections usually alleged, either against the authenticity of the gospels or the truth of the facts related in them, come necessarily under one or other of the following principal heads:

1st. The miraculous character of the facts stated.

2d. The want of harmony in the various gospel narratives.

3d. The contradiction between certain facts related by the evangelists and the facts of chronology or contemporaneous history as given us by profane writers.

Let us see what we are to think of each of these chief accusations.

1st. The miraculous character of the facts of the Gospel proves absolutely nothing against the authenticity and truth of them, unless we claim to reject *a priori*, without any proof, all miracles as impossible. If, as logic and common sense require, we admit the possibility of miracles, the miraculous events related in the gospels cannot be urged against the veracity of the evangelists: these facts are capable of proof like any other, first by the senses, and afterward by testimony when they have ceased to exist. Later on we shall speak *ex professo* of the possibility of miracles and their verification (ch. III. art. 2).

2d. As to the variations in the gospels, they may be ranged into two classes: variations through *omission*, when one evangelist omits what another includes, is silent when another speaks; variations through *contradiction*, when several evangelists give apparently irreconcilable versions of the same fact.

The first are of no importance whatever, and this is the case with the majority of the variations found in the gospels.

We know, moreover, that the apostles, whose teaching, like that of the Jewish rabbins and according to the command of Jesus Himself, was essentially oral, wrote only occasionally, with no intention to form a complete body of doctrine, nor to relate all the acts of Jesus. The evangelists expressly declare that they are far from having written all that they knew upon this subject.

The variations through contradiction constitute a more serious difficulty. But let us remark that the contradictions between two versions of the same fact, even if duly proved, impugn the accuracy only of certain *details of the fact;* they do not authorize us to reject either the *substance of the fact, or other facts* concerning which the narrations agree. Now the apparent contradictions between the evangelists all relate to *insignificant* points, unimportant details.[1] As to the whole history, and the precious and touching truths contained in the simple gospel narrative, the agreement is complete. Never have writers better described the same person; never have they more strikingly exhibited that perfect unity which is the appanage only of truth.

3d. In regard to the disagreement of the Gospel with the facts of the history of that time, by making the same distinctions we shall attain the same result. These variations, which are, moreover, very few, may also be ranged as omissions and contradictions.

The first class prove nothing, particularly as the Gospel does not deal with facts which at that period would certainly have come within the province of the historians of Rome and have figured in contemporaneous annals; it relates the history of a carpenter, living in a city of the province, and whose influence was at first sufficiently restricted to have escaped the attention of Suetonius and Tacitus. When the

[1] A few slight errors in unimportant details in no way weaken the authority of an historian. When there is question of an inspired historian, we can attribute no error to him; but in our present study we are considering the gospels only as *historical* documents.

Christians became numerous enough in Rome itself to awaken the attention of philosophers and of the Roman officials, that is, about thirty years after the death of Christ, then, and then only, would the great annalists have to mention them. It is precisely at this period that Tacitus speaks of the Christians (followers of Christ) as persecuted in Rome by Nero.

There remain the contradictions which may be found between the very small number of dates mentioned in evangelical history and the general chronology of contemporaneous history. As we have already said, even though we could not explain them, or do away with them by any plausible supposition, the only result would be to make doubtful the dates of certain events in the Gospel, the name of some governor of Judea at that period, and similar absolutely secondary points. But the essential facts would remain no less firmly established; it would be no less incontestable that Jesus Christ came into the world, that He spoke in prophecy, that He wrought miracles, that He died on the cross, that He rose from the dead. Now these are not points of secondary but of primary importance which cannot be disputed, and which serve to prove the divinity of the mission of Christ and of His work, the Christian religion.

In regard to the difficulties concerning details, they are to be found stated and explained in the commentaries on the Holy Scriptures.

B. Reply to Special Objections.—Let us remark, first, that it is not at all astonishing that we should sometimes be perplexed concerning the interpretation of a text when there is question of peoples whose customs, habits, and language are so different from our own. Many things which are obscure to us, and seem at times to imply contradiction, must have been very clear, very comprehensible to contemporaries, and consequently required no explanation. Thus, according as linguistics, numismatics, history, and geography advance, the obscurities disappear and the texts become clearer.

First Objection.—There have been false gospels, hence ours may be false.

Reply.—1st. It would be just as reasonable to say there is false coin, hence there is no genuine. It is the contrary of the proposition which is true, and we may say with Pascal: "Instead of concluding that because there are apocryphal gospels there are none that are genuine, we have to admit, on the contrary, that there must be genuine gospels since there are apocryphal, and that it is the genuine which have given rise to the apocryphal." The latter could have been only counterfeits of the real gospels, to which this very attempt at imitation renders homage. In fact, if the authors of the apocryphal gospels presumed to relate such things, and succeeded in obtaining credence for them, it was only because they were more or less in harmony with the authentic gospels, of which they assumed the character and authority, and because one and the other were in accord with recent events, with tradition, with all the monuments, with all the contemporaneous memories of Judea.

2d. We have positive proof of the false character of the gospels called apocryphal, while, on the contrary, the authenticity and truth of our four gospels are established, as we have seen, by incontestable proofs. In proportion as these bear all the marks of absolute authenticity the others bear evidence of improbability or bad faith. "These compositions," says Renan, "should not by any means be placed on a footing with the canonical gospels."

3d. These apocryphal gospels were never accepted by the Church and they soon disappeared, while our four gospels have always been distinguished as the only authentic ones, not only by the Church, but by heretics and pagans themselves. "The Church," says Origen, "has four gospels; heresy has many."

Second Objection.—We are told by Strauss that all religion among the Greeks, the Romans, the Germans, and the Indians began with myths, that is, with fables, in which

a moral idea, a physical event, etc., was represented under the figure of a man who never existed.[1] He also claims that it is the same with the Christian religion, where all that belongs to humanity is attributed to a unique hero, to Jesus Christ.

Reply.—1st. What we have just said in regard to the absurd consequences of any fraud on the part of the apostles is equally applicable to the hypothesis of a myth. We should have to admit that a myth, a lying fabrication, founded an institution as real, as efficacious, as indestructible as the Church; that a myth wrought the conversion of the world; that the very authors of the fraud and millions of their followers laid down their lives to witness to its truth.

2d. That other religions should be based upon fables is perfectly natural, since they are false. For this reason their origin is carefully assigned to prehistoric times, that is, to an obscure period where the imagination of the poets is untrammelled by historical facts. It is quite otherwise with Christianity: it belongs to a period subjected to the full light of history, to a period of intellectual activity, where even scepticism was rife, to a period, consequently, where fabulous relations would be received with even greater incredulity than at the present day. How can the mythical characters of other religions compare with that of Jesus, so lifelike, so imbued with sweet and simple majesty? The most superficial observer, to recognize the incontestable character of historic truth in the Gospel, has only to compare the mythical legends, always so obscure, so vague, confounding times, places, and persons, with the detailed, explicit narration of the acts of the gospel hero.

3d. Moreover, to apply the system of myths to Jesus Christ is to destroy all history. Certainly no one doubts the existence of Napoleon I. and the reality of his renowned deeds. Yet by having recourse to myths we could demonstrate very

[1] M., June and July '77; Lord Arundel, Nature-myth Untenable; C. W. xvii. 209.

plausibly that the great conqueror of modern times never existed.[1] If we are told that the works of Napoleon survive him and powerfully protest against the hypothesis of a myth, we do not deny it; but the Church also and the whole Christian world, the works of Jesus Christ, have shone before the eyes of the whole universe for more than eighteen centuries; their very existence proves most clearly that Christ, as He is represented in the Gospel, was the grandest and most powerful reality that ever appeared in this world.[2]

THIRD OBJECTION.—Renan in his "Life of Jesus," not daring to reproduce the too absurd theory of Strauss, modifies it in a way to attain the same end, that is to deny the divinity of Christ. As he has no belief in the supernatural, and alleges that no miracle has yet been proved, he denies all that is miraculous in the life of Our Saviour. It must necessarily be attributed to the excited imagination of His disciples; all that they relate of miraculous events are only legends with no historic value.

REPLY.—We shall not reproduce here the magnificent and annihilating arguments with which Renan's sad and impious romance has been refuted, but content ourselves with a few reflections.

1st. Renan's whole theory rests solely on the affirmation of the non-existence of the supernatural and of miracles. But whatever the vigor of this affirmation, it does not cease to be purely gratuitous, unproven, and contrary to the legitimate and universal belief. Let us remark, first, that if we prove the existence of one miracle since the beginning of the world, Renan's entire structure crumbles to its base. Now we shall prove, very decisively, the reality of numerous miracles.

2d. All that we have said of Strauss' myths is equally

[1] This has been done by the Protestant Archbishop Whately in a brilliant *jeu d'esprit* against Strauss entitled "Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon Buonaparte." D. R., Oct. '77, p. 559.

[2] See Lacordaire, 7th conf. on Jesus Christ.

applicable to Renan's legends. The arguments which destroy one are equally fatal to the other.

3d. Renan is in contradiction with his own theory when he affects to respect Jesus. According to him this Jesus was nothing more than a base impostor, who, knowing that he was a mere man like his fellows, allowed himself to be honored as a worker of miracles and adored as a God.

4th. Let us add that this same writer gives in his book numerous and absolutely manifest proofs of bad faith; he goes so far as to falsify texts with the greatest effrontery, to cite them in a sense contrary to their natural and certain signification; he refers the reader to passages saying the very opposite of what he claims. Abundant proofs of this want of honesty are to be found in Henri Lasserre's interesting work entitled *Le 13e Apôtre.*

Conclusion and Transition.—The inevitable conclusion of the preceding pages is that the Pentateuch and the gospels possess, in an historical point of view, incontestable authority, and merit unreserved belief. They afford an invulnerable basis for the proofs in favor of supernatural religion, which we shall presently give. Supported by these documents we can establish successively the divinity of the primitive revelation, then that of the Mosaic religion, finally that of the Christian religion. This historic method will have the advantage of being very complete, and it has been employed to advantage, particularly in the last century, by the defenders of the faith.

Contemporaneous infidels, Voltaire particularly, had in fact accumulated against the teachings and the relations of the Old Testament a quantity of sophisms which it was necessary to destroy. But these objections, devoid of all foundation, and bolstered, for the most part, by scoffs and jests, have lost their force; we have no need to occupy ourselves with them.

To-day the discussion has reached the very heart of the question. The rationalist school pretend to find in Jesus sometimes a wise man who by the power of his genius has

done much to promote the progress of the human race, sometimes an arrant impostor by whom men have been too long deceived. We shall boldly attack these impious statements and furnish direct proof of the divinity of the Christian religion, the crown and completion of the other two with which it is intimately united. When we shall have established that Jesus Christ was truly sent by God, *His testimony alone*, henceforth incontestable, will abundantly suffice to establish the divinity of the two *religious phases* which prepared man for His coming.

We shall demonstrate that Jesus Christ has been truly sent by God to impose upon men a new religion, more perfect than those which preceded it.

CHAPTER III.

DEMONSTRATION OF THE DIVINITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

ART. I.—REMARKS ON THE METHOD TO FOLLOW IN THIS DEMONSTRATION.

1st. Among the distinctive signs of true revelation the Fathers and apologists, interpreters of Christian tradition, have always placed in the first rank miracle and prophecy, which is also a miracle of the intellectual order. They have always seen here the incontestable testimony of God, the seal, as it were, of Heaven's communications with earth. For a long time ancient and modern adversaries of Christianity agreed with its defenders on this point; though they denied the reality of miracles attested by Christians, they never questioned the irrefragable value of a miracle fully demonstrated.

2d. That rationalists should object to this method we can readily conceive. Rejecting revelation completely, all that remains to them is a purely natural religion which has sprung in a perfect state from the human intelligence and conscience. This religion, they tell us, is only a code of morals; its precepts escape the inquisition of science; they must be observed, however, for man is made to live in society. If this is the case, the principal character of the true religion is the morality of the doctrine: it furnishes the supreme criterion which each one's own reason should enable him to appreciate. As to miracles, it goes without saying that they reject them completely, or admit them only in name. All that is represented in the Scriptures as supernatural events, miracles, prophecies, should be

regarded as figurative expressions, as representative laws and duties; these events must be brought into the category either of rational concepts or of natural facts. In this does the office of interpreter consist; here is what Kant, the first author of this theory, calls moral accommodation.

3d. Even Catholics have sometimes been perplexed as to the proper method for an apology of faith. In answering the difficulties and sarcasms which the infidels of the last century had accumulated, in the name of science and philosophy, against miracles, the defenders of the faith felt that they could not be too wary, and deemed it wiser tactics to demonstrate the moral beauty of the Christian religion and the wonderful changes it had wrought in the world. Such considerations are of undoubted value, and we ourselves will have recourse to them later; we do so the more willingly that we find in them proofs of a direct intervention on the part of God.

4th. The true method, however, is that which the Church has always used: it consists in stating, first, the proofs *directly furnished by God*, and consequently most proper to establish the divinity of the fact of Revelation, that is, miracles and prophecies. Let us hear, on this subject, the opinion of Cardinal Pie, bishop of Poitiers. "Miracle," the illustrious prelate writes, "is the veritable pivot of the Christian religion. Neither through His prophets nor through His Son did God endeavor to demonstrate by any process of *reasoning* the possibility of the truths which He taught, or the fitness of the precepts which He imposed upon the world. He spoke, He commanded; and as a guarantee of His doctrine, as a justification of His authority, He worked miracles. Hence we are in no way permitted to abandon or weaken, by placing in a subordinate rank, an order of proofs which occupies the first place in the economy and in the history of the establishment of Christianity. Miracle, which belongs to the order of facts, is inestimably more convincing to the multitude than all other kinds of arguments;

it is a means by which a religion is imposed and made popular." (Instr. Synod.)

But we have a still higher and more decisive authority. Here is the explicit declaration of the Vatican Council: "In order that the homage of our faith may be in harmony with reason God has willed to add to the interior aids of the Holy Spirit exterior proofs of His revelation, that is, divine facts, particularly *miracles* and *prophecies*, which, demonstrating with evidence the almighty power and infinite knowledge of God, afford in behalf of divine revelation very certain signs suitable to the intelligence of all." (Const. on the Catholic Faith, ch. 2.)

We see now why prophecy and, particularly, miracles have been so fiercely attacked by rationalists. It is for us, consequently, to put in the clearest light their convincing power. To this end we shall give a few philosophic notions concerning miracle and prophecy, refute the principal objections, and thus prepare the ground upon which our demonstration of the truth of Christianity is to be erected.

ART. II.—MIRACLE AND PROPHECY.

Four questions present themselves for our examination: I. The nature of miracle and prophecy. II. The possibility of miracle and prophecy. III. The means of recognizing and distinguishing them from natural facts. IV. Their demonstrative value or conclusive evidence.

I. Miracle.[1]

Nature or Notion of Miracle.—The word miracle comes from the Latin word *mirari*, to be astonished. The strictly

[1] Bp. Hay; Card. Newman; Kegan Paul in C. T. S. xvi.; Schanz, II., ch. 10; Walworth, ch. 15; Hettinger, R. R., ch. 3; Chatard, essay 16; Boedder, B. III., ch. 3; Hunter, I., treat. I., ch. 2 ff.; I. E. R., Aug. '97; P. Murray, Essay on Miracles; Archbp. O'Brien, pt. iii., ch. 6; Spalding, Evidences, lect. 5.

etymological meaning is something which causes astonishment. Now nothing causes more astonishment than an effect the cause of which is unknown or which seems to be beyond the causes operating to produce it.

It is true that among these marvellous effects there are some the cause of which is unknown to certain minds, but very clear to others. Thus the cause of eclipses is a mystery to the unlettered, but no secret to the astronomer. Evidently this is not the kind of miracle of which there is question here.

There are other effects which no created force could produce and which claim divine operation, the intervention of God Himself. Such are veritable miracles, and it is in this class that we find characteristic proof of revelation. Yet *any* intervention on the part of God does not suffice to constitute a miracle, for God intervenes in all the acts of His creatures. There must be a special intervention by which God suspends in a particular case the general laws which He has imposed upon all things.

A miracle thus understood may be defined as an effect which exceeds all the forces of nature and can be produced only by the special intervention of God Himself. There are also miracles which are absolutely beyond the senses, as, for example, the eucharistic transubstantiation and the extraordinary operations of supernatural grace. Miracles of this kind, though very real, evidently cannot serve to prove the truth of a religion; we must have palpable, manifest facts. We can understand, therefore, why apologetic authors generally prefer the following definition, which we, in our turn, have adopted. A miracle is a sensible effect which surpasses the natural energies of the universe, and which, in the general conditions under which it is produced, manifestly reveals an immediate and extraordinary intervention of divine almighty power. We may also say that a miracle is an extraordinary manifestation of God through a sensible work which no human agent can produce.

Possibility of Miracles.—A reasonable man who admits the existence of God cannot doubt the possibility of miracles. This was so apparent even to the impious Rousseau that he says: "Can God perform miracles, that is, can He derogate the laws which He has established? To treat this question seriously would be impious if it were not absurd. To punish one who answered it negatively would be doing him too much honor; he ought to be sent to a madhouse. But who has ever denied that God can work miracles?" The conviction of the possibility of miracles is, moreover, so natural to man that belief in miracles has existed at all times among all peoples. Neither the Jews nor the pagans, nor even the bitterest and cleverest enemies of Christianity, such as Celsus and Julian the Apostate, ever thought of combating Christianity by objecting that the miracles upon which it rests are impossible. Yet it would have been a summary and very easy means of stifling the new religion in its cradle.

The modern enemies of the supernatural and of all positive religion have shown themselves wiser in their generation. As the impossibility of miracles is a vital point in their system and cannot, moreover, be proved, they have been careful to establish it as an *incontestable axiom*. This manner of proceeding, though no doubt convenient, is not very scientific or convincing: the absence of argument is too apparent. There are those, however, who claim to support the axiom with apparent proofs furnished by philosophy and science. We shall have occasion to show how little foundation they have.

Remark.—The same motive which makes miracles the chief aim of the attacks of modern rationalism, explains its fierce warfare against the dogma of divine Providence, that is, the special intervention of God in the government of the world, and the efficacy of prayer, an inevitable corollary.[1]

[1] With rationalists nothing is easier than to make assertions of this kind: "Absolute, inflexible necessity governs matter; the law of

Thesis.—Miracles are Possible.

First Argument.—We might confine ourselves to this simple statement: Miracles exist, hence miracles are possible. Yes; we shall prove that history witnesses to sensible facts which no human agent can produce, and which require extraordinary and immediate intervention on the part of God. Thenceforth all that can be alleged against the possibility of miracles is absolutely null: *ab esse ad posse valet illatio;* the existence of a fact demonstrates its possibility. And let us remark that the fact of one well-established miracle, at any period of the world, is sufficient to refute the capital objection of unbelievers, and thus destroy the entire foundation of their impious arguments.

Second Argument.—Miracle is possible if there is nothing to prevent it either on the part of creatures or on the part of God. Now there is nothing to prevent it:

a. On the part of creatures, who in their being and their manner of existence are and remain essentially dependent

nature is a mechanical, eternal, immutable law, which is confounded with the laws of reason itself; it is the most rigid expression of necessity; no power can escape this necessity, which knows no exception or restriction." But let them prove these assertions, denied by the intimate conviction of the human race, and the universal and perpetual custom of prayer and sacrifice. We can readily see, moreover, how they lead to the most wretched fatalism and to the destruction of all morality. It is certain, on the contrary, that the constancy (absolute constancy) of force in the universe cannot be scientifically demonstrated; it is certain that the animal world is not devoid of all creative faculty, that the movements of the will alter the constancy of the total energy of the universe; it is certain that above the law of the conservation of matter and of force reigns an enlightening and completing principle, a sovereign idea which dominates all: the idea of *order* and of *finality*, without which the world would be no more than a *mass of facts;* it is equally certain that in the system of the world the laws could have been other than they are. (Duhamel.)

on their Creator, and absolutely submissive to His sovereign will. If they are subject to the general physical laws which God has established, why should they be less so to a special order of this same God?

b. On the part of God, whose almighty and independent power created the world and freely gave it the laws by which it is governed. Why should God be subject to these laws? Why should He be so bound by His own work as to be no longer its master, but its slave? Why cannot He, like a human legislator, determine in advance the exceptions to the laws He makes? Because, for example, God has willed that, as a general rule, moisture and heat should be the conditions for the germination and development of plants, has He deprived Himself of the power of causing grain to germinate and ripen without heat and without moisture? Such a statement is simply absurd; it reduces the Creator, the sovereign Master of the world, to a sort of purely passive being, ruled by a supreme necessity; in a word, it denies the very existence of God. In fact one must be an atheist to affirm the impossibility of miracles.

Objection.—What is the great objection raised against these arguments so conclusive for every upright intelligence? That a miracle is contrary to the immutability and to the wisdom of God; in other words, that any change in the general laws established by God would indicate ignorance or fickleness of purpose on His part.

Reply.—1st. The immutability of God is in no way compromised by a miracle, since a miracle argues no change in the divine decrees. *Deus opera mutat,* says St. Augustine, *non consilium.* God decrees, by the same indivisible and eternal act of His will, the laws themselves and the exceptions to these laws in special cases. Miracles, therefore, form a part of the divine plan. The will of God, as well as His thought, embraces in one single act the past, the present, and the future, the whole universe and each of the beings who compose it. In determining that the usual action of these laws

shall be suspended in a special case, God does not change His decrees; He fulfils them.[1]

2d. The wisdom of God is no more compromised than His immutability.

a. A miracle is performed for a determined and reasonable end: in view of some moral good. It behooves us to remember that the entire order of the universe includes both the moral and physical order; but the physical world is destined to serve the moral. Hence it is evidently worthy of God to refer everything to the salvation of souls and the preservation of His Church; it is worthy of His wisdom to confirm the truth of a doctrine coming from Him, or the

[1] The objection in regard to the immutability of God has no more weight against the efficacy of prayer than against miracles. In hearing our prayers, God, who has foreseen and willed all things in one simple act, does not change; He is not like us limited by time, which is His creature as much as any atom in the universe; He does not interrupt the course of general laws, He fulfils them; He does not modify His resolutions, He executes them. We do not pray, St. Thomas tells us, in order to change the divine plan, but to obtain the accomplishment of that which, in this plan, was left dependent on our prayers. "When a soul," says Euler, "offers a prayer worthy to be heard by God, we must not imagine that it is only then that it reaches the knowledge of God. He has heard it from all eternity, and He has ordained the world expressly in favor of this prayer; so that its fulfilment is a consequence of the natural course of events." This last thought meets all the vain difficulties raised on this subject. Ward, Theism, II., p. 158. Gilbert, Miracles and Prayer.

It is well to remark here that we do not regard as miracles extraordinary graces obtained by prayer, but which are the effect of physical forces which God has prepared from the beginning with the intention of answering the prayers which should be addressed to Him. When, in answer to public prayers, a plentiful rain puts an end to a long drought, it may be a striking favor and a visible protection of Providence, but as it is the effect of natural agents, and not a derogation of the laws of nature, it does not manifest direct and immediate action on the part of God, and is not a miracle. Rickaby, Cambr. Conf. I. Ser., n. 21. On *Christian Science*, the unchristian theory of "favors by prayer," see Dr. Hart in S. S. L., vol. I., essay 2; M. S. H., Aug. 1901; The Deadly Error of Ch. Science (Philad.).

authority of one of His ambassadors, or the sanctity of one of His servants, or His own divinity. Now nothing can do this more effectually than a miracle. Man is too familiar with the ordinary marvels of nature to think of them in connection with their Author; to make him recognize the presence and action of the Creator, his attention must be awakened and impressed by a derogation of the laws of nature. "Miracles," St. Augustine tells us, speaking of the multiplication of the loaves, "are divine works which are performed to raise the human mind to the knowledge of God by means of sensible acts. There are few who deign to observe the truly admirable and astonishing works of Providence in the smallest grain of wheat, hence God, in His infinite mercy, has reserved certain things outside the ordinary course and order of nature to be produced at opportune times, in order that the marvellousness of a spectacle, not greater but unusual, shall awaken the astonishment of men upon whom daily marvels make no impression. And in fact it is a greater miracle to govern the entire world than to feed five thousand men with five loaves of bread; the first, however, excites no astonishment, while we are filled with admiration of the second, not because it is greater, but because it is more rare." [1]

b. God is no way like a workman who, after he has conceived and fashioned a complicated instrument, may touch sometimes a wheel, sometimes a spring, sometimes a lever, either at his pleasure or caprice, or to remedy an unforeseen defect. God never alters His designs and has no need to revise His work; but He has need to show that He is absolute Master of His work, and for this purpose He makes special use of miracles: it is in every way worthy of the sovereign Master of all things to confirm His word by extraordinary effects of His infinite power.

c. Let us add that miracles, necessarily rare, and exceptions

[1] On the moral end of miracles, read Bossuet's admirable Discourses on Universal History, pt. ii., ch. 1.

to general laws, can in no way disturb the harmony of creation or interfere with the study of science: though at the word of a thaumaturgus a man born blind is restored to sight, or a dead man comes forth from the tomb, it will not prevent nature from following its habitual course and mankind will remain subject to sickness and death. The following from Bergier may serve as a summary of this whole matter:

"No one can doubt the possibility of a miracle, once he admits that it is God who created the world, that He did it of His own free will and in virtue of His infinite power. In fact, according to this, the only true hypothesis, God regulates the order and march of the universe; He has established the connection which we perceive between physical causes and their effects—a connection for which we can assign no other reason than the will of God; He has given to the different agents, according to His good pleasure, the various degrees of force and activity which it pleased Him to bestow; all that happens is an effect of this supreme will, and the order of the universe would be different had He willed it other than it is. In decreeing from all eternity that a dead man should remain without life, that wood should be consumed by fire, God has not deprived Himself of the power of derogating these two laws, of restoring life to a dead man, of preserving a bush in the midst of flames, when He wills thus to awaken the attention of men, to instruct them, or to convey His positive precepts.

"If He has done this at certain periods, it is clear that the exception to the general law was as undoubtedly foreseen and determined by God from all eternity as the law itself; and that thus the law and the exception in such a case are the effect of the wisdom and the will of God, since, before creating the world, God knew what He willed to do and what He would do throughout future ages. . . . It was with fullest liberty and unconstrained by necessity that God established a certain order in nature; He was free to regulate it otherwise. He had only to decree that from the dust of the human body

buried in the earth another man should spring, after the manner of the oak from the acorn. The resurrection of the dead, therefore, is not a phenomenon which transcends the divine power. When God raises a man from the dead it argues no change in the divine will, which has resolved from all eternity to restore him to life and thus derogate a general law. Nor can this exception be said to destroy the law since it follows its wonted course in the case of all other men. A resurrection, finally, interferes in no way with the established order, or impugns the eternal wisdom which created this order."[1]

Possibility of Verifying a Miracle.—There are adversaries of Christianity who, unable to deny the possibility of miracles, endeavor to accomplish the same end by another means, and claim with Rousseau that it is at least impossible to verify a miracle; but this new attempt is, as we shall demonstrate, as fruitless as the first.

For the perfect establishment of a miracle it is only necessary to prove two points: 1st, the existence of the fact itself; 2d, the miraculous nature of the fact. Now we affirm that in certain cases this double verification is possible and easy.[2]

We say *in certain cases*, for we by no means claim that all miracles may be verified in themselves: have we not already said that certain miracles, like the eucharistic transubstantiation, are, because of their suprasensible nature, incapable of palpable proof? As to miraculous facts which come under the senses, it is clear that there may be cases which it is difficult for the unlettered, or even for scholars themselves, to verify. But let us remark that the affirmation of our adversaries *is general;* if a fact is miraculous, they maintain that it is necessarily beyond our power of investigation.

[1] Consult on this subject the conference of Frayssinous on miracles.

[2] Burnet, Path which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church, ch. 6.

Thesis.—There are Miracles of the Existence of Which we may (I) Have Certain Knowledge; (II the Miraculous Nature of Which we may Discern Scientifically or Philosophically.

1st. Since a miracle is a sensible fact, it may be known, like all facts of this kind, either by the testimony of the senses or by ordinary human testimony. To be certain, for example, that a man walks upon the waters of the sea, that a leper is instantly healed, that a dead man is raised to life, do we need anything more than sound organs? To be sure that the body of Lazarus, first, was in a state of decay, and that it was afterward restored to perfect life, did the witnesses need any better organs than would suffice to convince them of life and of death in the case of any man? We must remark that what we verify by means of the senses is the act itself as it falls under the senses, and not the supernatural character or miraculous origin of the act; the latter is a matter of reasoning, it is a rational conclusion.

2d. There are also cases where it is very evident that a phenomenon is beyond all the natural forces operating at the time it is produced. In such instances one does not need to be an academician to recognize that the miracle is of divine origin. Is there any one, for example, who is not absolutely certain that it is not natural for the dead to come back to life? If you were told that the day will come when a man may by natural power, by a simple word, give life to a decaying corpse, would there not arise in you a protest stronger than all scientific systems, the protest of nature and common sense? Is it necessary to be a physicist, a physiologist, or a chemist to be certain that it is impossible to feed five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes? that a deep-seated ulcer is not cured by a verbal command? If, at the voice of one speaking in the name of God, I see a man who has been dead four days come forth from the tomb in perfect life, it would be impossible for me to attribute this effect to any natural cause, known or unknown, for it is an effect diametrically opposed to the most certain and universally acknowl-

edged laws. Yes, as long as it cannot be proved that a physician by a simple act of his will is capable of restoring a dead man to life, or that the imagination is sufficient to knit a fractured limb immediately, to restore sight to a man born blind, to still a tempest instantly, I am sure of being able to prove the miraculous character of a fact which I witness or which is verified by unimpeachable testimony.

To claim, as Renan dares to do, that a miracle, to merit belief, must take place in an amphitheatre under the eyes of the best physicians, physiologists, physicists, and chemists, before a commission of specialists allowed to choose, for example, the body that is to be restored to life, and to regulate the programme of the experiment; to claim, in a word, that God, if He wishes to be believed, must place Himself entirely at their disposition, and repeatedly, like a hired magician, produce the phenomenon before their eyes, is as impious as it is absurd. With such a claim no death certificate could be issued without a previous verdict of a commission in which all the academies must be represented.

Objection.—Since a miracle is an effect for which we can assign no natural cause, to be able to pronounce an event miraculous we must know all the laws of nature without exception; for one law of which we are ignorant may in certain cases, unknown to the spectators, change the effect of all the others. Now no one can flatter himself that he knows all the forces of nature and the various combinations of which they are susceptible. Hence it is always impossible to pronounce with certainty in regard to a miracle.

Answer.—1st. *a*. This objection, formulated by J. J. Rousseau, is no doubt specious; hence certain rationalists present it as irrefutable. As a matter of fact, however, it has no value whatever with sound reason. It only proves that one must not affirm the supernatural character of an event before having thoroughly examined all the circumstances under which it happened. But it could not prove the impossibility of ascertaining the supernatural character of a

miracle unless the laws of nature worked capriciously. But there is nothing less capricious than these laws. It is the very character of a natural law to produce the same effects under the same circumstances. Consequently from the moment we know that the circumstances are identical, a matter most easily proved in hundreds of cases, we are absolutely certain that a determinate phenomenon will naturally follow.

b. The universe, which is the work of infinite wisdom, forms a harmonious whole, ruled by laws which cannot oppose or destroy one another: this would be disorder. Hence, if a determined event manifestly contradicts a single known law of nature, it is superfluous, nay, absurd, to seek an explanation of it in another law. The whole and sole explanation of it must be sought in the free will and almighty power of God, who proclaims by a miracle His sovereignty over nature.

2d. The object of this objection is to frustrate the conclusive evidence of the miracles performed by Our Lord, and thus destroy His authority, that is, cast doubts upon the divinity of His mission. It is an easy matter to demonstrate that it fails of its end. In effect it supposes that a fact reputed miraculous may be caused by a force so completely concealed in nature as to escape the observation of scientists themselves. It would follow, then, that this same force, hidden as it is, was so well known to Our Saviour that He clearly foresaw and confidently announced the precise effect it would produce at a given time. Hence this objection supposes that a quantity of forces unknown to all, even to scientists, have constantly produced, as Jesus foresaw, effects contrary to those which they as constantly produce on all other occasions. Whence could Jesus, the carpenter of Nazareth, hold exclusive knowledge of a science so vast, so absolutely certain, if not from the inexhaustible source of all knowledge, from God? It is evident, therefore, that such an objection only changes the

character of the Saviour's miracles, and that if we deny this man miraculous power we are forced to grant Him miraculous knowledge.

3d. If, in order to be certain that a sensible effect has no possible cause in the forces of nature, it is necessary to know *all* these forces, then the conduct of man on all occasions and in the gravest circumstances of life is truly inexplicable. For example, he inters his dead with no certainty that they will not come back to life. And this has been the universal custom of humanity in all ages. For who would dare to claim that he knows all the forces of nature and their possible combinations? Who knows, consequently, whether a hidden, unknown force may not at any moment instantly restore life to a dead body? When this learned academician, who had the misfortune to lose his only son, was following the body to its last resting-place, was there any doubt in his mind as to the possibility of its naturally returning to life? Certainly not; and yet would he venture to assert that he knows all the forces of nature and all their imaginable combinations? In confiding these dear remains to the earth he is, alas, only too certain that all hope is over for him, and that no human effort can restore to him the son whom he mourns. We see that to claim that it is impossible to verify a miracle without knowing all the laws of nature is to mock mankind, for the example we have just given may be multiplied indefinitely. Hence we may have a perfect knowledge of certain forces in nature and their undoubted effects, though we do not know all the natural forces and their various combinations.[1]

[1] No doubt we often hesitate to pronounce a verdict in regard to certain facts of a marvellous nature; so we say we must be cautious when there is question of a miracle, and accept it only with good evidence. But what does this prove against miracles? Absolutely nothing. Prudence is necessary in a great many other things. There are moments when, if we were asked to say whether it is night or day, we could not always answer categorically, and in certain circumstances opinions on the subject would be divided. Yet no one would claim

4th. If we can never pronounce in regard to a miracle without full knowledge of all the forces in nature, neither can we affirm of any phenomenon that it is the result of a certain law we have formulated, since it may be produced by some natural force of which we are ignorant. In this case all natural science becomes impossible. In fact the very object of the natural sciences is to establish and formulate the certain and constant laws of natural phenomena. If the objection were serious, who would dare to affirm the existence of any law, when the phenomena announced as its invariable result might be counteracted by another force concealed in nature? Yet we see physicists, chemists, and astronomers formulate such laws with every assurance, although they do not know all the forces in nature. With the same legitimate assurance we claim a resurrection from the dead to be a miracle, for, without knowing all the laws of nature, we are sure that a lifeless body cannot naturally return to life. To declare that a certain article of the code has been violated one need not know the whole collection of laws. We see that the objection urged against miracles impugns the very science in the name of which it is presented. We have reason to be proud of our faith when it is so clearly evident that the attacks directed against it are equally subversive of moral and social laws, of all science, and of reason itself.

5th. This objection rests mainly on an error in regard to the requisite degree of certainty; it was in anticipation of this error that we spoke, on page 46 ff., of the *criterion of certainty* and of the various means by which certainty may be obtained. There is an absolute certainty which commands the assent of the mind and excludes even the possibility of doubt. Thus it is absolutely impossible, for one who understands the terms, to doubt the truth of these propositions: A triangle has three sides; twice three is equal to three

that it is always impossible to make this distinction between the full light of day and the darkness of night.

times two; the whole is greater than one of its parts. The same certainty exists in regard to my own existence, and even in regard to the existence of other men, and of the universe, and of a number of phenomena which fall directly under my senses.

But when there is question of certain exterior facts, of the existence of Cæsar, for example, of the conquests of Charlemagne or of Napoleon, I am also certain; but this certainty, however great, does not exclude the possibility of doubt, it only makes doubt unreasonable. It is the same with innumerable practical truths upon which our daily actions and our whole social life depend. Is it absolutely certain that the sun will rise to-morrow? that I belong to a certain nationality? that I am of sound mind? that those whom I call my parents or my brothers are really such? that such a possession is really mine? Is the contrary absolutely impossible or does it imply contradiction? Certainly not; yet I very properly act without any doubt in this respect. The reason of this is that in the majority of cases truths of this kind present themselves so clearly to the mind that we cannot refuse our assent without contradicting nature and subverting the intellectual, moral, and social constitution of man. Certainty, again, may exist where doubt is rigidly possible; but if doubt here is not a formal contradiction, as in the case of absolute certainty, it is great folly, for it is resisting the spontaneous conviction of the common sense natural to all men. Thus it implies no absolute contradiction to doubt the conquests of Alexander or the existence of New York, but in doing so we despise the dictates of reason. If this certainty, which suffices in all the natural sciences, and which guides men generally in all the acts of social and rational life, is persistently claimed by some to be only a great probability, it is merely a question of words with which we have no need to concern ourselves, for this kind of probability, Buffier says, is regarded by mankind as certainty, and to refuse to

accept it as such is to be wanting in common sense. Now, a miracle being a sensible fact, it cannot be proved with absolute certainty, excluding even the possibility of doubt; but, like all exterior facts, it may be established by the evidence of which we have just spoken—the evidence with which men are necessarily satisfied even in the gravest events of life, and upon which scientists themselves formulate the laws of science.[1]

Remarks.—1st. The following reflections will convince us that it is possible to distinguish true miracles from the illusions or marvels which may be the work of the Evil One.

a. Whatever the natural faculties of the prince of darkness, or the qualities of which his fall has not robbed him, it is certain that this enemy of God can do nothing without the permission of the sovereign Master of all creatures. Now the truth, the goodness, the sanctity of God cannot permit this fallen angel to imitate the divine works in such a way as to lead man *invincibly* into error, and thus drive him to eternal ruin. We say *invincibly;* for God, having endowed man with reason, does not dispense him from the obligation of exercising that faculty in order to guard against illusions.

b. There are certain marks, both positive and negative, which enable us to distinguish true miracles, or those wrought by divine power, from the marvels produced by the Evil One. If, for example, the miracle is accomplished in the name of God, or if it has been foretold by genuine prophecy, or if it is performed in confirmation of a doctrine fitted in every way to lead men to serve God better, etc., it cannot come from the Evil One. One thing particularly incontestable is that the Evil One cannot be the author of the miracles performed by Our Lord and His disciples, for they

[1] Cf. references pp. 39, 49. "I maintain that many a man has been hung in England, and justly hung, on the evidence of illiterate persons, in no way better educated or better apt to observe the things that passed before their eyes, than were Peter and Matthew and John." Rickaby, l. c.

were wrought against him, and he would not fight against himself. Now these miracles suffice for our purpose. If, on the contrary, the effect of miracles is to violate the precepts of modesty or to accredit an immoral doctrine, they cannot be attributed to God. The doubtful character of the agents employed by the spirit of darkness in miracles, the undignified, grotesque methods to which they habitually resort, usually make it easy to divine the origin of their marvels.

c. There are, moreover, miracles, called of the first order, which transcend the power of all created beings, visible or *invisible*, and which absolutely require the immediate intervention of God Himself, as, for example, the resurrection of the dead. Now such facts are not lacking in the Gospel.

d. Let us say further that we have no certain knowledge even of the existence of evil spirits, except through Revelation, which is in itself a great miracle.

2d. Outside of Christianity *extraordinary facts* are related which would seem to require divine intervention.[1] Such are, in paganism, the feats ascribed to Vespasian and to Appolonius of Thyoneus, and, in later times, the marvels related of the Catholic missionaries in the extreme East, and of the convulsionaries who flocked to the tomb of the Jansenist deacon Paris. But in these remarkable events, which are a mixture of illusion and imposture, and frequently of questionable morality, the superhuman element, if it enters at all, is so weak that it requires only the intervention of any spiritual being. In any case there is no analogy between equivocal marvels of this kind and the numerous and striking miracles related in the Gospel. What can be compared, for example, to the multiplication of the loaves, to the resurrection of Lazarus, to the cure of the man born blind, to the walking upon the waters, to the stilling of the tempest? The works of Christ have all the same character

[1] Newman on Miracles, pt. ii.; Historic Sketches, I.

of divine power, simplicity, and goodness. There is in them nothing bizarre, no ostentation or vain show, no design to astonish the crowd or strike it with terror. Let us observe also that the miracles of the Gospel bear, directly or indirectly, upon the admirable dogmatic and moral teaching of Our Saviour, while the other events mentioned rarely have any laudable end.

3d. We have no need to dwell here upon spirit-rapping and the general manifestations of the Spiritualism of the present day, which is a renewal of paganism.[1] Let us only observe, with authors versed in the subject, that though much of it is fraud and prestidigitation, yet many marvels connected with it are so well established by historical truth that we cannot reasonably doubt them. It is no less certain, however, that spiritualism is a shameful and very dangerous superstition. Let us content ourselves with quoting a few words of Mgr. d'Annibale, who sums up the history of table-moving and American Spiritualism. After stating the principal facts of Spiritualism he adds: "They who take it up as an amusement flatter themselves that these spirits are no other than the souls of the dead. They are mistaken: they are devils; St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom affirm it, and pagans themselves, Porphyrius for example, have recognized and acknowledged it; one must have lost his reason to doubt it." We shall also find many excellent things on this question of Spiritualism and the others of which we have just spoken in Bonniot's work, "*Le miracle et ses contrefaçons.*"

4th. This might be the place to speak of the wonders of hypnotism,[2] particularly of the cures effected by sugges-

[1] Gmeiner, Spirits, etc.; Tyrrell, Faith of Millions, II. Ser., n. 21; The Danger of Spiritualism (St. Louis); Br. W. ix. 332, 352; C. W. xviii. 145, 318, 606; M. lxvi. 1, 200; lxxxi. 34; A. C. Q. vi., vii. 208, viii. 153; D. R.; Old Ser. xxiv. 408, New Ser. iv. 525, ix. 253, Jan. '99.

[2] D. R., III. Ser. xxv. 241. On the Moral Aspect of Hypnotism see Dolphin and A. E. R., Sept. 1902; I. E. R., Apr. '99. On *Theosophy* see Clarke; also D. R., Apr. '92, p. 337.

tion or otherwise; but the scientific character of the question is not sufficiently advanced to occupy our attention here. Let us be satisfied to observe that we may apply to these wonders many things mentioned in the preceding remarks, particularly what was said in refutation of the objection founded on the hidden forces of nature. Moreover, we can find no trace of hypnotic methods in the innumerable maladies other than nervous which Jesus cured. In any case, in a large number of His miracles, notably the multiplication of the loaves, the stilling of the tempest, and the resurrection of the dead, there is no possible place for hypnotism. Now these miracles abundantly suffice to prove the divinity of Our Saviour's mission.

Value of Miracles Regarded as Proof.—A miracle is an authentic confirmation of the doctrine in favor of which it is produced.

a. A miracle is a derogation of the laws of nature; hence it can have no other author than God, the author and master of nature. Now God cannot lend His almighty power to further imposture or error. Hence when a man proposes a doctrine as coming from God and supports it with a miracle, it is God Himself who marks this doctrine with the seal of His authority. This man, therefore, cannot be an impostor, and the doctrine which he teaches is necessarily true. It is in this sense that St. Augustine says: "Miracle renders authority sensible, and authority commands faith."

b. It is, moreover, the conviction and the belief of all peoples that miracles prove the divinity of a mission or a religious doctrine. Once it is confirmed by positive miracle, man, unless blinded by prejudice or passion, no longer hesitates to accept it as true; he feels instinctively, and he is fully convinced, that the miracle comes from God and is the divine seal of Revelation.

II. Prophecy.[1]

Its Nature.—Prophecy consists in announcing in advance, accurately and positively, actions which depend on the free determination of God or man. It may be defined as the certain prediction of a future event which cannot be known, through its natural causes, to any created intelligence. It is clear that the predictions of astronomers announcing eclipses, of a statesman who foresees political changes, are not prophecy, for they are deduced from natural causes which may be known to man. The definition alone of prophecy shows that it is a species of miracle; thus God has given it as one of the chief signs of the authenticity of divine revelation. It is a form of miracle specially fitted for this end, for it is suited, like revelation itself, to the capacity of every intelligence.

Possibility of Prophecy.—Prophecy is possible, but to God only. It is evident that no creature can, by his unaided intelligence, know certain events which form the subject of prophecy; but God, on the contrary, infinite Intelligence and Knowledge, necessarily knows all that will ever be; He knows the future determinations of free causes, such as the will of man, as well as the future results of all natural causes, even of those which are not yet in existence. Now what He knows He can manifest to man. He can, therefore, prophesy.

Value of Prophecy as Proof.—A fulfilled prophecy is a certain proof of the divinity of the revelation in favor of which it was made. In effect:

1st. It constitutes a *true* miracle, and it has, consequently, the convincing power of a miracle.

2d. Prophecy is possible only to God, hence it is a sort of divine revelation; and as God cannot confirm error, it follows

[1] Maas, S.J., Christ in Type and Prophecy, introd.; Schanz, II., ch. 11; Hettinger, Rev. R., ch. 3.

that the whole doctrine of which this prophecy forms an integral part must come from God.

3d. Thus all peoples have given this meaning to real prophecy. For men recognized without difficulty that if a prophecy could confirm a lie, God Himself would be accountable for leading men into error.

With the assistance of the notions which we have just developed, and supported by the Old Testament and particularly by the gospels, the historical authority of which has been placed beyond controversy, let us come now to the essential object of the first part of this Course, the demonstration of the divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ, and consequently of the religion which He came to reveal to the world.

ART. III.—TEN PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF THE MISSION OF JESUS CHRIST, AND OF HIS WORK, THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

I. First Proof.

THE MIRACLES PERFORMED BY OUR LORD.[1]

1. Number of these Miracles.—There are few pages in the Gospel which do not tell us of one or several miracles performed by Our Lord. He truly appears as the *sovereign Master of nature.* The infirm and the sick of all kinds were brought to him in large numbers, not only from various parts of Judea, but from Syria and other neighboring countries; and Jesus cured them by a simple word, or by the imposition of His hand, or by the contact of His garments, or even by a secret virtue which went out from Him (Matth. iv.; Luke viii.). He changed water into wine, filled the nets of His apostles with a miraculous draught of fishes, appeased the fury of the wind and the tide, delivered demoniacs from the possession of the devil, raised the dead to life. And

[1] Wiseman, Essays, vol. i.

yet the evangelists mention only the marvels most striking in themselves or because of the circumstances which accompanied them; they are content to refer only in a general way to the others. (John xxi.)

Among the numerous miracles given in detail and which suffice to make the life of Jesus the most marvellous that ever appeared on earth, let us quote in particular:

A. *The cure of the paralytic* (Matth. ix.; Luke v.), witnessed and watched by the unfriendly Pharisees and Scribes. The concourse of people, moreover, was so great that the friends of the sufferer, in order to bring him to Jesus, were obliged to lower him through the roof. (We know that the roofs of the houses in the East were clay terraces.)

B. *The two multiplications of the loaves*, which borrow a great force from the testimony of the multitude whom Jesus fed in the desert with a few loaves and a few fishes; the fragments gathered each time after the repast filled several baskets (Matth. xiv. and xv.; John vi.).

C. *The cure of the man born blind* so admirably told by St. John, ch. ix. The strenuous efforts of the Pharisees to disprove this miracle, and the official investigation to which they subjected the witnesses, confirmed it the more.

D. *Many resurrections from the dead.* Miracles of this kind must have been numerous, to judge by Our Saviour's answer to the disciples (Matth. xi. 5). Here the resurrections from the dead are placed in the same category as the healing of the sick: the blind see, the dead rise again. The Gospel relates specially the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus, for whom the mourners had already assembled (Matth. ix.; Mark v.; Luke viii.); that of the son of the widow of Naim, whom they were bearing to the tomb and whom Jesus restored to life with this sovereign command: "Young man, I say to thee, arise"; and finally that of Lazarus, the most remarkable of all. Jesus was some distance from Bethania, the home of Lazarus; He arrived there four days after the death of His friend, who had been placed in the tomb

after unequivocal signs that decomposition had begun: "he stinketh." In the presence of a large concourse of witnesses belonging to the more enlightened and educated classes, and for the most part hostile to Our Saviour, Jesus utters a command and Lazarus comes forth instantly from the tomb, notwithstanding his hands and feet were bound with winding-bands and his head was enveloped in a winding-sheet. The witnesses saw that the bands had to be loosed before he could walk. Hence Christ told them: "Loose him and let him go." (John xi.).

2. Circumstances Connected with these Miracles.—1st. The reality of these miracles and of a number of others could be perfectly established, for they were performed in open day in the presence of great multitudes, who flocked not only from all parts of Judea, but from the neighboring countries, to witness the marvels of which they had heard, or to experience the effect of Our Saviour's power; in the presence, also, of His most implacable enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, astute men interested in branding an imposture.

2d. They were so *palpable* and so *striking* that their miraculous character could be appreciated as readily by the simple and ignorant as by the scholars. To do this one only required the testimony of the senses and an unbiassed mind. Some of them were miraculous in themselves, as the cure of the man born blind, the resurrection of the dead; others in the circumstances which accompanied them, as the cures instantly effected by a word, by simple contact, or even at a distance.

3d. Moreover, if these miracles, performed in the full light of day and so frequently repeated, were not real, how can we explain the ever-increasing confidence which the people manifested in Jesus? Why did they continue during several years to bring Him the lepers, the blind, the deaf, paralytics, demoniacs, if He had not cured other sufferers?

4th. For eighteen centuries these mysteries have been sifted by the most minute criticism on the part of Christians,

Jews, and pagans; their truth is triumphantly established by every trial, and they have obtained a greater and more constant assent than ever has been accorded in the world. The explanations which rationalists have given of these miracles in order to set aside their miraculous character, are generally so ridiculous and miserable that they amount to an open confession of their utter inability to banish the supernatural.[1] If all this is not sufficient to establish a fact beyond dispute, then, to be consistent, we must confess to absolute scepticism of historic truth.

CONCLUSION.—Miracles, as we have seen, are the *letters patent* of one purporting to be God's ambassador to men.

Now, 1st, Our Lord never ceased to perform miracles and to proclaim that He was sent to teach men the way of salvation. Even the miracles performed for the relief of human misery, miracles which abounded in Our Saviour's life, prove that one who could thus dispose of divine, almighty power, who could subject all nature to His will, must be accredited by God. It is evident that the doctrine which He announces in the name of God cannot but be divine, otherwise God would authorize what is false; He would confirm the imposture and the impostor, He would sanction a teaching contrary to truth.[2]

Moreover, 2d, Jesus performed a large number of His miracles for the *special and formal* purpose of proving the mission with which He proclaimed Himself charged. Let us quote a few of these miracles:

a. When asked by the disciples of John the Baptist whether He was the Messias expected for the salvation of the world, Jesus replied by citing the evidence of the miracles which He performed before them: "The blind see . . ."; thereby manifestly declaring His divine mission in confirmation of which He gave the most striking miracles.

[1] For a splendid refutation of the theories of Strauss and Renan see Picard, pt. ii., ch. 3.

[2] Lacordaire, 2d conf. on Jesus Christ; Gigot, Biblical Lect., l. 8, n. 3.

b. When the Pharisees, who, it would seem, appreciated the conclusive evidence of miracles, ask one of Him as a special proof of His mission, Jesus, who had unceasingly multiplied such proofs before them, cites, this time, the future miracle of the Resurrection (Matth. xii.).

c. Another time He tells them that if they find it difficult to believe His teaching, to believe for the very work's sake (John xiv.).

d. On another occasion the wily Pharisees, disturbed by His words, said to Him: "How long dost Thou hold our souls in suspense? If Thou be Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus answered them: "I speak to you and you believe not: the works that I do in the name of My Father, they give testimony of Me. . . . The works themselves that I do, give testimony of Me, that the Father hath sent Me." He added, affirming more formally not only His divine mission, but the divinity of His person: "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though you will not believe Me, believe the works: that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me and I in the Father." (John x.)

e. At the resurrection of Lazarus, Jesus formally declares that He performs the miracle that the people may recognize His divine mission (John xi.).

II. Second Proof.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

1. The Special Importance of this Miracle.—Among all the miracles of Our Saviour there is one more important than all the others, that of the Resurrection. Yes; Our Lord's Resurrection is of itself a summary and peremptory

[1] Ward, Devotional Essays, n. 9; Schanz, II., ch. 16; Hettinger, Rev. R., ch. 5; Gibbons, Ch. H., ch. 16; Wiseman Science, etc., l. 6. But see especially Picard, pt. ii., ch. 4; M. lxvi. 195.

demonstration of the divinity of His mission and of His religion. It is a proof, moreover, which has the advantage of being eminently suited to every intelligence: to understand it nothing more is needed than an upright heart which seeks the truth in good faith. In fact it is incontestable that if Our Saviour returned to life by His own power, He is God; and if it was by the power of God, His mission is divine; for it is impossible to suppose that God, whose sanctity, goodness, and wisdom are infinite, would fulfil the prediction of an impostor, and mark his doctrine with the incontestable seal of truth.

Our Lord Himself, in predicting His Resurrection, presented it as the most striking mark of His divine mission. The apostles did the same in their preaching; and when there was question of choosing a disciple to replace the traitor Judas, they required that it should be one who had witnessed the life, the death, and the Resurrection of their Master (Acts i. 22). St. Paul does not hesitate to declare that the faith of the Christian is vain if Christ did not rise from the dead (1 Cor. xv.). Finally, the enemies of Jesus, the Jews themselves, so fully appreciated the conclusive testimony of His Resurrection that they placed a guard at the sepulchre to render any deception impossible; and, in later times, the opponents of Revelation left nothing undone to destroy faith in this most important miracle.

Let us demonstrate that the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, the divine Founder of Christianity, is as real, as *certain* as it is important; let us prove that God has surrounded it with so many guarantees that to deny it we must obstinately close our eyes to the light.

2. Historical Statement.—Let us begin by stating briefly the principal details of this great event as we find them in the gospels.[1]

Friday, the eve of the Sabbath, about three in the after-

[1] See Coleridge, The Works and Words of Our Saviour, ch. 19 (same in Life of Our Life, II., ch. 12).

noon, the soldiers came, according to custom, to break the legs of those who had been executed. After breaking the legs of the two thieves, seeing that Jesus was dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers opened His side with a lance and immediately there issued blood and water (St. John, an ocular witness of the death of Jesus, chap. xix.). Toward evening, Joseph of Arimathea, a noble councillor, asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. Pilate inquired of the centurion who had presided at the execution whether Jesus were really dead; upon being assured that He was, he allowed Joseph to have the body. It was then taken down from the cross; Joseph and another of Jesus' disciples, named Nicodemus, bound it in linen cloths, and placed it with spices in a new sepulchre, which Joseph had had hewn for himself in a rock. Then, after rolling a large stone against the entrance to the sepulchre, they went away.

The next day, which was the Sabbath, the chief priests and Pharisees begged Pilate to place a guard at the sepulchre. "We have remembered," they said, "that that seducer said, while He was yet alive: 'After three days I will rise again.' His disciples may come and steal Him away, and say to the people, He is risen from the dead, and the last error shall be worse than the first." Pilate bade them guard the sepulchre themselves, which they did by sealing the stone and placing a guard about it.

Now the next morning, at dawn, there was a great earthquake; an angel in human form, whose countenance was as lightning and whose raiment was as snow, rolled the stone from the sepulchre and sat upon it. The sepulchre was empty: all that remained were the linen cloths and the napkin which had bound His head, carefully folded. The guards fled in terror to the chief priests and related what had happened. Upon learning it they gave the soldiers money to induce them to say that, while they were asleep, the disciples of Jesus came and carried away His body.

The same day and the days which followed, up to the time

of His Ascension, Jesus appeared, at intervals, to Mary Magdalen, to the holy women, and to the disciples, sometimes individually, sometimes collectively. He talked with His disciples of the kingdom of God, and gave them sensible proofs of the truth of His Resurrection, eating with them, showing them and even letting them touch the wounds which still remained in His hands, His feet, and His side. Finally He appeared, a last time, on a mountain of Galilee to more than five hundred of His disciples, and ascended before them into heaven (Matth. xvii.; Mark xvi.; Luke xxiv.; John xx.; Acts i.; 1 Cor. xv.).

This is a brief statement of the evangelic narration upon which we shall found our demonstration. If it is accurate, the fact which it relates can be accounted for only by divine intervention. This is so true that infidels themselves do not think of explaining it by natural causes, but they try to contest the reality of the fact.

3. Certainty of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.—The truth of the gospels has been fully established. Hence we cannot question the reality of the Resurrection of Jesus, which is given with so much detail by the sacred writers. It is well nevertheless, considering the exceptional importance of this miracle, to make it the object of a special discussion. To prove the reality of this resurrection, it is sufficient to establish: A. That Our Saviour was really dead when He was taken down from the cross; B. That He was afterwards seen fully restored to life. We shall add nevertheless a third proof no less decisive: C. The impossibility of any deception.

A. Jesus was truly dead when He was taken down from the cross.

a. St. John, an eye-witness, and the other evangelists affirm that He expired on the cross.

b. Nor can we doubt it, if we consider the inhuman torments which He endured before He was placed on the cross; it is even marvellous that He lived during the three hours;

the crucifixion alone, according to the historian Josephus, was sufficient to cause His death.

c. The soldiers did not break His legs, only because it was so evident that He was dead.

d. The thrust of the lance would have extinguished any remaining breath of life.

e. Pilate allowed Joseph of Arimathea to take the body only after the centurion had officially testified that Jesus was really dead.

f. The Jews themselves were fully convinced of His death; had they had the least doubt they would have taken pains to verify it before placing the guard at the sepulchre, and if necessary they would have despatched their victim. Thus neither Roman nor Greek sophists, nor the Sanhedrim, nor the Rabbins ever ventured to say that Jesus was not dead. And even in our own day this miserable hypothesis is rarely used against the reality of the resurrection.

B. Jesus Christ truly rose from the dead.

a. This was attested by numerous eye-witnesses, who, after they had seen their divine Master expire upon the cross, beheld Him again in life, not in a dream, nor during sleep, but in open day and when they were in full possession of all their faculties; they heard His words, received His commands, touched and felt His members and His wounds, and even ate with Him.

b. During *forty days* they met Jesus under the most varied circumstances, near the tomb, on the way to Emmaus, in the cenacle, on the seashore, on Mount Olivet, etc. At one time He appeared to the holy women, at another to Peter, at another to the disciples on the way to Emmaus; on one occasion He was seen by the whole apostolic college, with the exception of Thomas, who refused to believe the testimony of his brethren, and again by the whole college, including Thomas, who was convinced by the evidence of his senses; at another time he appeared to seven of His apostles on the shore of the sea of Tiberias, and again also to an assembly of

more than five hundred apostles and disciples, most of whom were still alive when St. Paul appealed to their testimony (1 Cor. xv. 6).

c. Finally, these men laid down their lives in testimony of the Resurrection of Jesus. And yet, so far from being the victims of a too ready credulity, they at first accepted the news of the miracle only with great difficulty: it "seemed to them as idle tales" (Luke xxiv. 11), and one of them, Thomas, even refused to accept it on the unanimous testimony of the other apostles, and protested that he would not believe until he could put his hand into the wounds of Jesus.

Thus the *nature*, the *number*, and the *various circumstances* connected with these apparitions, as well as the *number* and *variety* of the witnesses, make it evident that the *fact of the resurrection of Our Saviour* is no less certain than *that of His death*. This miracle, therefore, is absolutely incontestable.

C. We might be satisfied with this decisive demonstration. Nevertheless, in further confirmation of the truth of this great miracle, and at the same time to refute the usual objection of those who deny it, we shall show that the hypothesis that the apostles carried away the body of their Master is absolutely untenable. To this end let us prove: 1st. That they could have had no intention to carry away the body. 2d. That if they had, they never could have succeeded in carrying it out. 3d. Let us add that had they resorted to fraud, they never could have induced the whole world to believe that Jesus had risen.

1. The Disciples could have had no Desire to Carry away the Body of Jesus.—No man engages in a perilous enterprise without some determining motive; still less would a number of men unite to carry out an execrable plot, in which they not only had no interest, but which was against all their best interests. This, however, is what we have to admit if the apostles conceived the design which infidelity attributes to them.

1st. They would have acted without motive of any kind. In fact the apostles believed in the proximate resurrection of their Master, or they did not believe it, or they were doubtful.

In the first case it would be absolutely useless to carry away the body. In the second case all that remained for them was to abandon the cause and the memory of a man in whom they no longer had the slightest faith. In the third case (which is true, as we learn from the desponding words of the disciples of Emmaus, and the unwillingness of the apostles to believe the Resurrection when it was announced to them) the simplest common sense would have made them wait the event, and be guided by its consequences. Therefore the thought of carrying away the body of their Master could never have occurred to the apostles unless—and there is nothing to justify the supposition—they were the most irrational of men, unless they were all equally foolish and inconsequent, for they must have concerted the plan together.

2d. They had, on the contrary, the most powerful reasons for not engaging in such an enterprise:

a. They saw themselves surrounded by the enemies of Jesus, implacable enemies who had treated Him most cruelly and had put Him to death. They could expect from these men only opprobrium, tortures, and death.

b. And they had to fear from God, the avenger of crime, the punishment due to falsehood, blasphemy, and impiety.

c. They were, moreover, certain to fail most shamefully and ignominiously in their enterprise. How could men, without education, without influence, without fortune, flatter themselves that they could succeed in the most insensate design that could possibly be imagined, viz., induce the whole world to adore as God an impostor who had been crucified in Judea?

d. Finally, if Jesus did not rise from the dead He was henceforth, in the eyes of His disciples, an impostor, the criminal author of their shame and their misery. Would

they have been willing to brave everything for such a man and to expose themselves to condign punishment in this world and in the next?

2. HAD THE APOSTLES DESIRED TO CARRY AWAY THE BODY OF JESUS THEY COULD NOT HAVE CARRIED OUT THEIR DESIRE.—To be convinced of this we need only consider briefly the nature and difficulties of such an enterprise.

The tomb was hewn in the rock, closed with a large stone, sealed and guarded by soldiers. Now what means had the apostles of executing such a design? We can imagine only three: violence, or bribery, or deception. All three were equally impracticable.

a. Violence. The apostles, who, we know, were shamefully timid, who fled in the most cowardly manner and abandoned Jesus during His Passion, were not men to force their way through a guard of soldiers and break public seals. Had they done so, their action would not have remained either unknown or unpunished.

b. Bribery. How could they bribe the guards? They were poor, and they would have had to win over the soldiers on the very spot where they were posted; they would have had to win them all without exception, for if only one refused the bribe it would be sufficient to betray them. And these soldiers, would they dare to count upon one another?

c. Deception. How much there was to make this means impossible! How could they reach the sepulchre? By a subterraneous passage? They must cut it in the rock in a single night, without waking any of the guard, and then must have filled it up again on leaving so that no trace of their work remained. They must, moreover, have amused themselves, while removing the body, with stripping it of the graveclothes, and carefully folding the napkin which bound the head, and finally they must have rolled back the stone which closed the sepulchre, apparently to avoid giving any alarm. What a tissue of absurdities!

Did they go by the ordinary road to the sepulchre? Then

they must have passed through the guard, broken the seals, rolled back the stone, and, after divesting the body of the graveclothes, apparently with much deliberation, and folding the napkin which bound the head, returned with their prize by the way they came; and they accomplished all this so silently that they were completely unobserved! Perhaps the guards were asleep! Were they all asleep? Was there no one left to warn the others of the attempt they were told to expect? Was their sleep so profound that all this movement about them in the silence of the night did not waken one of them? But let us admit that they were all buried in profound slumber, who was there, then, that could proclaim and bear witness to the apostles' theft? Of what value is the testimony of sleeping witnesses? And then how was it that no search was made for the body thus stolen notwithstanding all the precautions taken by the authorities? Why were not the delinquent guards severely punished? Why did the Jews feel obliged to give them money to induce them to accuse themselves of having failed in their duty, and to divulge their own shame? How was it that these same Jews, who afterwards frequently reproached the apostles with preaching in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, did not simply accuse them of having stolen the body of their Master? Hardly two months had elapsed after the Resurrection before the apostles were preaching the great miracle, yet the Jews never attempted to explain it away, but contented themselves with having the apostles scourged and commanding them to be silent.

Therefore we see that unbelief, do what it will, is invariably contradicted by its own false arguments. The most wretched of all sophistry is that by which the human conscience seeks to evade divine certainty; for it is impossible to contest the truth of the Resurrection without rejecting the evidence of reason and common sense.

3. Fraud could not have Converted the World.—Even admitting the impossible hypothesis that the apostles

wished to steal the body of Jesus, and that they succeeded in their insensate enterprise, there remained a still greater difficulty which they could not have overcome: they could never have convinced the whole world that Jesus had risen and that He is God, when in reality He was only a malefactor condemned by human justice to die an ignominious death on the cross. How numerous, in fact, were the obstacles to the success of such a project!

1st. All the accomplices, authors, or abettors of this criminal intrigue must have agreed among themselves as to how they were to present their deception, and they must have pledged themselves to endure the greatest tortures solely to insure the impossible success of an infamous fraud.

2d. It was necessary, moreover, to deceive the numerous disciples who had taken no part in the plot, and to persuade them to believe in the apparitions, purely imaginary, of Jesus, and to believe with a faith strong enough to brave the most horrible torments and death itself rather than admit the least doubt of the reality of the Resurrection.

3d. It was necessary also to deceive the Gentiles, who feared His severe morality, despised His poverty, and insulted the folly of His death on the cross. It was necessary to deceive the Jews who hated Jesus, who had put Him to death on the cross, and who had every interest in branding the imposture. We know that three thousand Jews were converted at the first preaching of St. Peter, and five thousand at the second.

4th. Finally, all these wonderful effects would have to be produced without the aid of miracles, by the simple affirmation of these men; miracles could not be looked for, for God would not lend His power in behalf of miserable impostors.

CONCLUSION.—What could be more conclusive evidence than the proofs, particularly when taken together, which we have just given? What shall we believe if we refuse to

admit a fact so solidly established that it admits of no reasonable doubt?[1]

OBJECTIONS.—We must mention, nevertheless, a few of the efforts of the enemies of Christianity to suppress this capital miracle. The futility of their attempts only renders the truth more striking.

1st. Strauss has taken much pains to explain how the body of Jesus disappeared from the tomb, for he acknowledges that it is a burning question. He has finally adopted the most unreasonable solution: he asserts that the body remained in the sepulchre. After what we have said, it is evident that this is an explanation contrary to all the gospels and even to all probability; the Jews, moreover, would not have failed to seize it in order to destroy from the first all faith in the Resurrection.

Renan's method of overcoming the difficulty, though more convenient, is hardly less ingenious: he declares that it is useless to try to solve the question, for we shall never know all the details. This declaration, however, does not prevent him from attempting a dozen solutions: that the apostles carried away the body; that the disciples took it with them into Galilee; that it was taken away by the Jews, or perhaps the owner of the garden; that the folded napkin indicates that a woman had part in the work. Finally, he rejects all these explanations, and concludes that the body of Jesus Christ disappeared by *chance!*

2d. It is equally embarrassing to these sceptics to explain the apostles' unalterable faith in the Resurrection. Strauss acknowledges that it is necessary to explain it. "If we do not find," he says, "a means of explaining, without a miracle, the origin of faith in the Resurrection of Jesus, we are obliged to deny all that we have said, and to renounce our enterprise." He rejects, moreover, the hypothesis of imposture on the part of the apostles, and justly concludes that a faith for which they were willing to die could not be founded

[1] See Bourdaloue's sermon on the Resurrection.

on a falsehood. But when there is question of finding an acceptable explanation, he goes so far as to say that the apostles were deceived by their *imagination*. The Resurrection, therefore, of Jesus was, according to him and Renan, who finds the invention to his taste, merely an hallucination on the part of the disciples, the result of their excited imagination. "They were in a state of great excitement," he says, "and took for reality what was merely a trick of their imagination."

After the proofs we have given of the special guarantees of truth which the witnesses of the Resurrection afford us, is it further necessary to reply to an assertion so purely *gratuitous?* If we cannot believe such witnesses, whom can we believe? If the Resurrection of Jesus has no other foundation than an hallucination, the apostles must have believed that they saw what they did not see, that they heard what they did not hear, that they touched what they did not touch! Is not this diametrically contrary to the gospel narrative? So far from being ready to believe in the Resurrection, we know that they were very slow to accept the testimony of the holy women, or that of their brethren, or even of their own senses. The words of Jesus seemed to have made more impression on the hatred of His enemies than upon the love of His disciples. The first remembered perfectly that He had announced that He would rise again, therefore they took every means to prevent a fraudulent fulfilment of the prediction; the apostles, on the contrary, seem to have lost sight of these words of their Master. When Jesus appeared to them, they took Him for a spirit, and Our Saviour, to undeceive them, had to make them touch His wounds and had to eat with them. Are the victims of hallucination so incredulous and so difficult to convince?

And, mark you, according to this hypothesis all of the disciples, without exception, must have been the victims of hallucination, even the desponding disciples of Emmaus, even the incredulous Thomas, even the five hundred witnesses

of the Ascension of Jesus. And this impossible illusion must have lasted forty days and appeared in various and very numerous circumstances; and what is no less remarkable, it must have suddenly and completely disappeared after the Ascension!

Nor is this all. We have to admit that the removal of the stone from the sepulchre and the terror of the guards were only an illusion; that the guards also were victims of an hallucination; that the earthquake, the empty sepulchre, existed only in the imagination of the disciples. In truth we are tempted to ask whether writers who advance such things are not testing the credulity of their readers.

If all this were possible, we should still have to explain how, if Christianity is founded upon illusion, the apostles succeeded in establishing it, how it has regenerated the world, how, despite all obstacles, it has been perpetuated through all ages down to our own time. This would have been a much greater miracle than all the others.

Read in *Le 13e Apôtre*, by Henri Lasserre, a clever refutation of Renan's system. The author does justice to it by explaining in the *same way* the *alleged* return of Napoleon I. from Elba. He applies to the Hundred Days not only the system of Renan, but his very phrases, and thus he proves peremptorily that Napoleon never returned, that the alleged proofs of this return exist only in the deluded imagination of the admirers of the great conqueror of modern times.

Conclusion.—It is, therefore, absolutely certain that the evangelists were not deceived in regard to the Resurrection of Jesus, that they did not wish to deceive, that had they wished to deceive others they could not do so. Jesus, after His incontestable death on the cross, came forth alive from the tomb, as He announced, in proof of His divine mission; it follows, therefore, that He is sent by God, and that His work, the Christian religion, is a divine work.

III. Third Proof.

THE FULFILMENT OF THE PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE PERSON AND MISSION OF JESUS CHRIST.[1]

1. An Enumeration of Some of these Prophecies.— Since the fall of our first parents, God had never ceased to send successively numerous prophets to announce and describe, with more and more detail, the Messias, who was to replace the Mosaic religion with one more perfect, destined for all peoples and all ages. These divine ambassadors specify the time when the Messias will appear on earth, the family to which He will belong, the city where He will be born. They give, centuries in advance, minute details of His birth, His life, His death, His triumph over death and the world. Let us mention specially the celebrated prophecies of Jacob, Daniel, Aggeus, and Malachias, who appeared one after another, specifying more and more clearly the time of the Messias' coming.

Let us show, in a few special points, how minute are these prophetic details of the future Redeemer.

1st. The Coming and the Qualities of the Messias.— Son of Abraham (Gen. xii.), issue of the tribe of Juda (Gen. xlix.), through David (Ps. lxxxviii., Is. xi., Jer. xxiii., etc.), the Messias expected by all nations (Gen. xlix., Agg. ii.), who was to be born of a virgin (Is. vii., Jer. xxxi., Ezech. xliv.), in the city of Bethlehem (Mich. v.), before the subjugation of the nation (Gen. xlix.), in the seventieth week of years after the issue of the edict for the reconstruction of the Temple of Jerusalem (Dan. ix.), and before the destruction of this second Temple by a strange nation (Agg. ii., Mal. iii.).

His coming will be preceded by universal peace (Dan. ii., Ps. lxxi., Is. ii., Zach. iii.); His way shall be announced and

[1] Maas, S.J., Christ in Type and Prophecy; Veuillot, Life of Christ, Introd. iii.; Didon, Jesus Christ, Introd., n. 8; Gaume, Catech. of Persev., I., ch. 21 ff.; Hettinger, Rev. R., ch. 6.

prepared by a special envoy (Mal. iii.), whose voice shall resound in the desert (Is. xl.).

The Messias will be, in character and name, Jesus or Saviour (Habac. iii., Is. li., etc.), Emmanuel or God with us (Is. vii.), Christ or the anointed of the Lord (Ps. ii., xliv., Is. lxi., Lam. iv.), the Son of God (Ps. ii., Os. xi.), God (Is. ix., xxv., xxxv., xl., Ps. xliv., cix., Bar. iii., Mal. iii.), and hidden God (Is. xlv.), priest according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix.), the Just (Jer. xxiii., Wis. ii., Is. xlv., lxii., etc.), the holy One and the Saint of saints (Ps. iv., xv., Is. xii., Dan. ix.). His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God, the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of peace (Is. ix.).

2d. His Birth and His Youth.—Kings from the East will adore Him and offer Him frankincense and gold (Ps. lxxi., Is. lx.); Rachel (whose tomb is near Jerusalem) shall weep in vain for her children (Jer. xxxi.); the Saviour will dwell in Egypt (Os. xi.), and in Nazareth of Galilee (Is. ix.); He will converse with the inhabitants of Sion (Is. xii., etc.), and He will honor the Temple with His presence (Agg. ii., Mal. iii.).

He will be poor and in labors from His youth (Ps. lxxxvii.), and yet He will be king and eternal possessor of a kingdom which will extend to the utmost parts of the earth (Ps. ii.); He will be obedient (Ps. xxxix.), gentle and peaceful (Ps. cxix.).

3d. His Apostolic Career.—He will not cry nor have respect to persons; He will not break the bruised reed nor extinguish the smoking flax (Is. xlii.); He will seek that which was lost, the sheep which were lost; and that which was driven away He will bring again; He will bind up that which was broken, and that which was weak He will strengthen, and that which was strong He will preserve, and He will lead them in the way of justice (Ezech. xxxiv.); He will comfort all that mourn (Is. lxi.), and by His miracles He will open the eyes of the blind, unstop the ears of the deaf, and loosen the tongue of the dumb (Is. xxxv., xlii.). Yet

notwithstanding the intrinsic efficacy of His divine word (Is. xi., xlix.), notwithstanding the splendor of this heavenly light (Is. ix., xlii., lx.), the Messias will be a stone of stumbling, a rock of offence, a snare and a ruin to many of Israel (Is. i., vi., viii., xlii.).

4th. His Passion and His Death.—Surely He hath borne our iniquities and carried our sorrows, and we have thought Him as it were a leper, and as one struck by God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our iniquities, He was bruised for our sins: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His bruises we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, every one hath turned aside into his own way: and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. There is no beauty in Him nor comeliness: we have seen Him, and there was no sightliness, that we should be desirous of Him: despised and the most abject of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with infirmity, His look was as it were hidden and despised, whereupon we esteemed Him not (Is. liii.); a worm and no man: the reproach of men, and the outcast of the people (Ps. xxi.). What are these wounds in the midst of Thy hands? With these I was wounded in the house of them that loved Me (Zach. xiii.). They have dug My hands and feet, they have numbered all My bones. And they have looked and stared upon Me; they parted My garments among them, and upon My vesture they cast lots (Ps. xxi.). All they that saw Me have laughed Me to scorn; they have spoken with the lips and wagged with the head: He hoped in the Lord, let Him deliver Him; if He be the true Son of God, He will defend Him and deliver Him out of the hands of His enemies (Ps. xxi., Wis. ii.). Many calves have surrounded Me, fat bulls have besieged Me. They have opened their mouths against Me as a lion ravening and roaring (Ps. xxi.). They gave Me gall for My food, and in My thirst they gave Me vinegar to drink (Ps. lxviii.). I am made a derision to all My people, their song all the day long (Lam. iii.).

5th. The Establishment of His Church.—God will pour out His spirit upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem; He will give them a new heart, and put a new spirit into them (Is. xlvi., Ezech. xxxvi., Joel ii.). The word of God preached first in Sion (Is. ii.) will be brought by faithful witnesses (Is. xliii., xliv.) to Lydia, Africa, Italy, Greece, to distant islands, to people plunged in darkness who will be won to the truth (Is. lx., lii.). They will be brought through fire, they will be tried as gold is tried (Zach. xiii.). A new covenant will bring together all the peoples (Is. xlix., Jer. xxxi., Os. ii., etc.): the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the lion and the sheep shall abide together (Is. xi., Soph. iii., Jer. xxxii.).

6th. The Sacrifice of the New Law.—Malachias terminates the series of prophets. He crowns the magnificent chain of revelations concerning the Messias with the announcement that the sacrifices of the Old Law, hitherto offered only in the Temple of Jerusalem, will be replaced by a pure oblation which will be offered in all places and among all nations (Mal. i., x., xi.). Isaias and David add that the ministers of this sacrifice of the New Covenant will be priests chosen from among all nations (Is. lxvi.), under a supreme pontiff according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix.).

7th. Prophetic Figures of the Messias.—God wished that the future Redeemer should be continually kept before the mind and the imagination of His people. Thus He was not content to announce Him by the ministry of His prophets, but, in conformity with the genius of the Jewish people and of Eastern nations in general, He prefigured the Messias by living types and symbolic events. Let us cite among the first Isaac, Joseph, Moses, David, Jonas; among the second the paschal lamb, the manna, the brazen serpent. In fact the entire worship and all the institutions of the Jews may be said to have been typical. "All the administration of this people," says St. Augustine, "was only a continual prophecy of the king they expected." We must mention

this kind of prophecy; though it does not serve as the basis of our present proof, it will complete the demonstration we shall derive later from prophecy properly so called.

Five hundred years elapsed between the end of the Messianic prophecies and the beginning of their fulfilment. We know, moreover, that to render any doubt of the *anteriority* of the prophecies impossible, Providence had caused the Old Testament to be translated into Greek three hundred years before Christ, and that this translation, called the Septuagint, was spread throughout the entire world long before the coming of the promised Messias. But were they realized, these numerous prophecies uttered by a series of men during four thousand years, and predicting with more and more detail the same marvellous, extraordinary event which could not possibly be foreseen? This is the question which it is particularly important for us to examine.

2. Fulfilment of the Messianic Prophecies. — We have only to read the Gospel to be fully convinced that these prophecies were realized perfectly in Jesus Christ and only in Jesus Christ. The agreement of the Old and the New Testament is so striking that if we had not incontestable proof that the prophetic books existed centuries before Christ, we should be tempted to believe that these numerous and very precise details were written after the events, not by prophets, but by historians.

1st. *The period of the coming* of the Messias was so clearly determined and so well known throughout the world that, as soon as the Roman Empire and a general peace were proclaimed, not only the Jews but all nations looked for the great event. The event itself was predicted, as we have seen, and attested by all contemporary historians. "The people," says Tacitus, "relying on the ancient prophecies, were generally persuaded that the East would prevail and that from Judea would come the masters of the world." Suetonius and Josephus express themselves in almost the same terms. This hope of the promised Liberator was so general and so

strong among the Jews that they were ready to follow blindly any insurgent who proclaimed himself the Messias or His precursor. Hence the numerous revolts which preceded the ruin of Jerusalem.

It was very remarkable that while Europe expected a Saviour from the East, the people of India and China expected him from the West. Voltaire attests this in his additions to general history. From all parts the attention of mankind was centred upon a small point of the globe which Boulanger, another sceptic, calls "the polar star of the hope of all nations."

2d. *The other prophecies are no less fully realized.* We may say that the prophecies of the Old Testament are a portrayal of the life and the death of Jesus Christ, an abridged history of His works and of the marvellous establishment of His Church. The relation is evident and the application is not only easy, but it follows of itself. The prophets are the *witnesses* who unanimously testify in favor of Jesus, says St. Peter to the Jews (Acts x.). All their predictions, all the prophetic types, all the figurative institutions of the Old Law relate to Jesus of Nazareth, and prove that He is the true Messias designated by divine inspiration, the Saviour of the human race.

3d. Need we be astonished, then, to find the apostles, in order to convince the Jews of the divine mission of Christ, constantly appealing to the testimony of the prophets? To other auditors they presented arguments of another kind, but to their compatriots they could offer no more convincing testimony. Thus St. Peter made it the basis of the exhortations which converted thousands. And after testifying himself to the voice heard on Thabor he quotes the prophecies as still more incontestable proof (2 Pet. i. 19). And St. Paul, on his part, devoted entire days, from morning till evening, to convincing them that Jesus was prefigured in the law of Moses and the prophets (Acts xxviii. 23).

4th. Our Saviour Himself revived the courage of the disci-

ples by showing them that the things about which they were troubled were only the fulfilment of the Scriptures (Luke xxiv.). Thus He said to the Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting, and the same are they that give testimony of Me" (John v. 39).

CONCLUSION.—The fulfilment of so many prophecies, uttered so many centuries before the events foretold—events which could not possibly be conjectured, proves incontestably that Jesus is truly the Messias, the Saviour sent by God, announced and expected during four thousand years; that, consequently, the religion founded by Him and predicted for so many years is truly divine. In fact only He to whom all ages are as the present moment, only He whose wisdom and almighty power can prepare and direct events, could make such revelations. "The fulfilment of all the prophecies," Pascal truly observes, "is a perpetual miracle, and we need no other proof to recognize the divinity of the Christian religion."

We cannot resist citing here a magnificent page from Lacordaire on the subject of the Messianic prophecies (5th conf. on Jesus Christ):

"And now, gentlemen, what think you of this? Here are two parallel and corresponding facts, both certain, both of colossal proportion, one which lasted two thousand years before Christ, the other which lasted eighteen hundred years since Jesus Christ; one which announces a great revolution, a revolution impossible to foresee, the other which is its accomplishment, both having Jesus Christ for principle, for end, and for bond of union. Yet once more what think you of it? Are you bold enough to deny it? But what will you deny? The existence of the Messianic idea? But it is in the Jewish people who still live, in all the continuous monuments of their history, in the universal traditions of the human race, in the most positive avowals of the most profound unbelief. Would you deny the anteriority of the prophetic details? The Jews, who crucified Jesus Christ and who

have a national and political interest in depriving Him of the proofs of His divinity, declare to you that their Scriptures were formerly what they are now; and for additional certainty, two hundred and fifty years before Jesus Christ, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, all the Old Testament, by order of this monarch, was translated into Greek and fell into the possession of the Greek, the Roman, the whole civilized world. Would you turn to the other pole of the question, and deny the accomplishment of the Messianic idea? The Catholic Church, the offspring of that idea, is before your eyes—she has baptized you. Would you stand upon the point of junction of those two formidable events? Would you deny that Jesus Christ has verified the Messianic idea in His person, that He was a Jew of the tribe of Juda, of the house of David, and the Founder of the Catholic Church upon the double ruin of the synagogue and idolatry? But the two interested parties—and they are irreconcilable enemies—confess all this. The Jew affirms it and the Christian affirms it. Would you say that this juncture of colossal events at the precise point of Jesus Christ is the result of chance? Were it even so, chance is but a brief and fortuitous accident, its definition excludes the idea of continuity; there is no chance of two thousand years' duration and of eighteen centuries added thereto.

"Gentlemen, when God works there is nothing to be done against Him. Jesus Christ appears before us as the moving principle of the past as well as of the future, the soul of the times which precede Him as well as of the times which follow Him. He appears before us in His ancestry, upheld by the Jewish people, the most important social and religious monument of ancient times; and in His posterity, upheld by the Catholic Church, the greatest social and religious work of modern times. He appears before us holding in His left hand the Old Testament, the greatest book of the times which precede Him, and in His right hand the Gospel, the greatest book of the times which come after Him. And yet,

so preceded and so followed, He is still greater in Himself than His ancestors and His posterity, than the patriarchs and the prophets, than the apostles and the martyrs. Supported by all that is most illustrious before and after Him, His personal physiognomy still stands out from this sublime scene, and, by outshining that which seemed above all reveals to us the God who has neither model nor equal."

IV. Fourth Proof.

THE MIRACLES OF THE APOSTLES AND OF THE DISCIPLES OF JESUS.

1. The Prediction of these Miracles.—The religion which the disciples of Jesus were to establish was to encounter innumerable obstacles. Providence must needs lend the assistance of miracles to those charged with this ministry. Jesus, who desired that the divine power should shine forth in human weakness, *guaranteed in advance* this salutary assistance: "Amen, amen, I say to you, he that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do" (John xiv. 12. See also Mark xvi. 17, 18).

The disciples published this solemn promise of the Master in the Gospel, and thus in a manner pledged themselves to work miracles. It was a sort of challenge to the Jews and pagans to disprove the divine teaching: if they had not given striking proof of their miraculous power, the propagation of the Gospel would have been arrested at the very outset.

2. The Fulfilment of this Prediction.—To be convinced that the divine oracle was literally fulfilled we have only to look through the Gospels (Mark xvi. 20), the Acts of the Apostles, and ecclesiastical history. We find from these writings that nothing was more frequent than miracles at the beginning of the Church. Nor is this astonishing, for St. Paul tells us that miracles "are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers." According to St. Gregory the

budding tree of the Christian religion needed, in order to grow and thrive, the divine dew of grace.

1st. Among the numerous miracles of St. Peter related in the Acts let us mention particularly the cure of the lame man at the gate of the Temple (ch. iii.), that of the man ill of palsy (ch. ix.), and other cures effected simply by his shadow (ch. v.); the resurrection of Tabitha (ch. ix.); the miraculous deliverance of several of the apostles from prison (ch. vi.); that of Peter himself (ch. xii.). We find also numerous miracles performed by St. Paul at Ephesus and elsewhere by the mere touch of his garments (ch. xix.); the resurrection of a young man at Troas (ch. xx.), etc.

Two other miracles accomplished in connection with the apostles merit special attention: we wish to speak of the descent of the Holy Ghost and of the conversion of St. Paul.

2d. The miracle of *Pentecost* was both physical and moral: physical, in the descent of the Holy Ghost under the form of tongues of fire, and in the gift of tongues granted to the apostles; moral, in the complete transformation of the apostles (Acts ii.). One hundred persons were present in the cenacle when this great event took place, which was immediately carried through the world by the vast concourse of strangers who were then at Jerusalem. If the miracle had not been real and incontestable, the mere denial of these strangers, on their return to their various countries, would have sufficed to prevent the propagation of the Gospel.

3d. The miracle of St. Paul's *conversion* is sufficient of itself to convert a man of good faith.[1]

Here, in a few words, is the history of this marvellous event. Saul, a zealous persecutor of the Christians, was on his way to Damascus to arrest the disciples of Christ and bring them bound to Jerusalem; but at midday, as he nears Damascus, he is suddenly blinded by a great light and falls to the ground.

[1] Picard, pt. ii., ch. 4. Also the old but interesting pamphlet by Lord Lyttleton, "The Christian Religion demonstrated by the Conversion and the Apostleship of St. Paul."

He hears the voice of Jesus and immediately a complete moral transformation takes place in him. At the same moment Our Lord appears to Ananias and instructs him concerning the new convert. Saul is cured of his blindness by Ananias and receives baptism. After he has become Paul he is distinguished by his great love for Jesus and by his generous, persevering zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles.[1]

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the *reality of the facts;* they are related three times in the Acts: in ch. ix. by St. Luke; in chs. xxii. and xxvi. by St. Paul, who speaks of them again in the Epistle to the Galatians, ch. i. 15. When a man of the character of St. Paul relates a fact of this kind with the most minute details, and when we have also as guarantee his extraordinary conversion and the marvels which followed it, we cannot believe that he was the victim of an hallucination.

It is no less evident that such facts cannot be explained by *natural causes.* Renan, who declares all miracle impossible, must endeavor to find a *natural explanation,* but what an explanation it is! St. Paul was in a state of great excitement: he had a malignant fever and an inflammation of the eyes; then a storm broke out, during which he imagined he heard Our Saviour's voice; after the storm he had a sunstroke which made him blind! . . . Where are the proofs of all this? He takes good care not to give them. And yet this same Renan presumes to say, "It belongs to the rationalistic school to explain the events of history by adequate causes!"

4th. The gift of miracles, which marked the beginning of the Church, continued, for the same reasons, in a very special manner during *the first ages.* The Fathers of this period speak very positively of the wonders which were performed publicly and frequently before their eyes; they invite the pagans to witness them; they defy them, for example, to cite a demoniac who has not been delivered. The miracles, moreover, were so patent that the enemies of Christianity

[1] "St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity," by l'Abbé Fouard.

never dreamed of contesting them; hence the holy Fathers made no effort to prove the reality of them; all that they endeavored to prove to the pagans was that these supernatural works were wrought by the intervention of God, and not by that of evil spirits or magic.

5th. Ecclesiastical history records so many incontestable miracles of *each of the centuries which followed*, that the "Acts of the Saints" may be said to be a worthy continuation of the "Acts of the Apostles." To be convinced of this we have only to read the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*. Read, for example, what Sulpicius-Severus, the biographer and companion of St. Martin of Tours, relates of the miracles which he witnessed and which won for the holy bishop the surname of Thaumaturgus. No less astonishing and authentic are the wonderful works of St. Simeon Stylites, related by Theodoret, who witnessed them and wrote an account of them for the people who daily flocked to the column of the holy anchorite. We also find in St. Augustine's admirable treatise, "The City of God," a series of striking miracles, performed in his day and sometimes before his eyes, particularly by the recently discovered relics of St. Stephen, the first martyr. There is no doubt that these three historians are absolutely unimpeachable.[1]

6th. Who can in good faith deny that, even in our own day, God still renders to the divinity of His Son and of the Church, which is His work, the solemn and incontrovertible testimony of miracles?

Read, for example, in the fifth volume of the learned Abbé Moigno's *Splendeurs de la Foi*, the chapter entitled *Le miracle au tribunal de la science*, where, as he justly says, he "demonstrates completely by means of the most advanced science that five miracles performed in our day in the full light of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and similar in every respect to those of the Gospel, have been brilliantly

[1] An account of these facts is found in Butler's "Lives of the Saints," Jan. 5, Aug. 3, and Nov. 11.

attested by the most august and enlightened tribunal of the universe."[1]

REMARK.—It is well to observe that *one true* miracle is sufficient to prove the divinity of a religion in favor of which it is manifested. Now, as miracles in favor of the religion of Christ have been produced in every century, in order to destroy this present proof we should have to reject all the testimony of history, that is, the history of *all past ages*.

V. FIFTH PROOF.

FULFILMENT OF THE PROPHECIES MADE BY JESUS HIMSELF.

We have seen that Jesus faithfully fulfilled in His person the Messianic prophecies, thus showing that He is truly the Messias foretold by the prophets. Now we shall find still further proof of His divine mission in the prophecies which He Himself uttered. If prophecy is as great a proof as miracle of the divinity of a mission and of a doctrine, what is it when the event foretold is miraculous? If to prophesy is to perform a miracle, what is it to prophesy miracles? Now the prophecies of Jesus usually foretold miraculous events.

1. THE PASSION, THE DEATH, THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.—We shall not dwell upon Jesus' prophecies concerning His Passion, His death, and His Resurrection. For example, when He said to His disciples: "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed to the chief priests, and to the scribes and ancients, and they shall condemn Him to death, and deliver Him to the Gentiles: and they shall mock Him, and spit on Him, and scourge Him, and kill Him: and the third day He shall rise again" (Mark x.; Matt. xvii.). It is unnecessary to say how accurately, even in the smallest

[1] See Newman; Hay; A. C. Q. i. 337; D. R. New Ser. xxvi. 1, III. Ser. iv. 386, C. W. xxxii. 433. See also references, P. II., ch. 2, art. 2, II.

details, all these things were fulfilled. Jesus also foretold the treason of Judas, the flight of His disciples at the time of His apprehension, the triple denial of Peter, the descent of the Holy Ghost, etc.

We have just seen that He also predicted the miracles performed by His disciples and apostles. Let us insist a little upon the miracles which were to be realized at a later period, or even to embrace, so to speak, all centuries.

2. The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Dispersion of the Jewish People.—A. Jesus declared, at different times and in the most explicit manner, the misfortunes with which Jerusalem was threatened in the near future, the siege of the city, the entire destruction of the Temple. Speaking of the Temple to the disciples He said "there shall not be left here a stone upon a stone." They asked Him when this destruction would take place. "Amen," He said to them, "this generation shall not pass until all these things be done. . . . But before all these things they will lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, dragging you before kings and governors for My name's sake. . . . When you shall see Jerusalem compassed about with an army, then know that the desolation thereof is at hand." And again as He approached the unhappy city He exclaimed: "The days shall come upon thee, and thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and straiten thee on every side, and beat thee flat to the ground, and thy children who are in thee; and they shall not leave in thee a stone upon a stone, because thou hast not known the time of thy visitation. . . . Thy children shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captives into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the nations shall be fulfilled. . . . Amen I say to you, this generation shall not pass away till all things be fulfilled." (Matth. xxiv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xix.; xxi.)

Josephus, the contemporary Jewish historian, has trans-

mitted to us terrible details of the destruction of this city. If his accounts are to be received with entire faith, about a million men perished by fire, or by the sword, or by famine. He declares that no city since the beginning of the world ever suffered as did Jerusalem. We know that, after the taking of the city, the last combatants defended themselves in the Temple with unheard-of fierceness, and that Titus prohibited its destruction under the severest penalties, but in vain: a soldier, moved, Josephus says, by a divine inspiration, threw a flaming torch into one of the buildings, and the fire spread so rapidly that in a brief period the whole edifice was reduced to ashes. The catastrophe was so unforeseen and so complete that the conqueror could not but recognize and proclaim the divine intervention of which he was only the instrument.

When the Jews remaining in Judea made an attempt to rise under Adrian, he quelled the revolt by slaying six hundred thousand and dispersing the rest. They were afterwards forbidden under pain of death to enter Jerusalem, which was thenceforth called Ælia Capitolina.

In addition to this, Our Saviour's words concerning this event were still more solemnly confirmed. Julian the Apostate, in order to falsify the divine oracle, left nothing undone to rebuild the Temple. But the most extraordinary phenomena prevented the execution of his impious design. This is attested by the historian Socrates, by St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and even by the rationalist Gibbon, who acknowledges it with reluctance, and by the irrefutable testimony of the pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus, friend of the emperor and officer of the royal army. "When Alypius, assisted by the governor of the province, strenuously urged on the work, there issued," says Ammianus, "great balls of fire from the earth near the foundations, scorching and blasting the laborers and rendering the ground at times inaccessible; finally, the victorious element continuing to break forth upon the work-

men, as if obstinately and resolutely bent upon driving them away, Alypius was obliged to give over the enterprise." The result of this attempt was that in digging for the foundation of the new Temple that of the old was completely destroyed, thus fulfilling to the letter the words of the prophecy announcing that not a stone would be left upon a stone.[1]

B. We know how the prediction in regard to the *dispersion of the Jews* was verified. When a people is scattered among other nations, usually in a short time there is a complete fusion of the two races. Contrary to this law of history, the people of Israel, though dispersed throughout the world, continue to *form a race apart*, thus remaining, despite themselves, a perpetual witness of the fulfilment of the prophecies and of the curse which was laid upon this deicide people. "God," says Bossuet, "by a means of which there is but this one instance, has preserved the Jews, though out of their country and in a state of ruin, longer than the very nations who conquered them. We no longer find any trace of the ancient Medes, Persians, Greeks, nor even of the Romans. They are lost and swallowed up in other races. The Jews, though the prey of these ancient nations so celebrated in history, have survived them, and God, in preserving them, holds us in expectation of what He will still do for the remnant of this unhappy people formerly so favored. Yet their obduracy serves as a means of salvation to the Gentiles, and gives them the advantage of finding where least expected, in the hands of the Jews, the Scriptures which have foretold Jesus Christ and His mysteries." (Disc. on Univ. Hist. P. II., ch. xx.)

3. Persecutions.—"You shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i. 8). When Jesus foretold to the disciples their success in the apostleship He announced to them at the same time that they would be hated and persecuted because of His name. "If the world hate you,

[1] Card. Moran, Occasional Papers, p. 38; Parsons, Studies, I.

know ye that it hath hated Me before you; if they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you" (John xv. 18, 20). "Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves; . . . men will deliver you up in councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues. . . . You shall be hated by all men for My name's sake." (Matth. x.) "Blessed shall you be when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you, and shall reproach you and cast out your name as evil for the Son of man's sake. Be glad in that day and rejoice; for behold, your reward is great in heaven." (Luke vi.) "The hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doth a service to God" (John xvi.).

Such was the oracle. The simple reading of the Acts shows how perfectly it was fulfilled. We find the apostles reviled, dragged before tribunals, cast into prison, scourged, yet rejoicing in this ignominious and cruel treatment, "because they were counted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus." The persecution of the just is realized even in our own day.

4. Charity among Christians.—"By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another. . . . That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee: that they may also be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." (John xiii. 35; xvii. 21, 23.)

Jesus predicted that His Church would be distinguished by a boundless charity, by an admirable union of hearts and souls. Now what does history tell us? In the very beginning of the new religion the distinguishing mark of Christians was a love which made them one heart and one soul. Later centuries furnished innumerable heroes of Christian charity, who practised all the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, devoting themselves to relieving the miseries and comforting the sorrows of poor humanity. We shall demonstrate this more fully in another part of our work (P. II., ch. 5).

5. This might be the place to mention the prophecies re-

lating to the establishment of the Church and its perpetual duration; but we shall have to speak of them in the exposition of our sixth proof.[1]

Conclusion.—The fulfilment of these various prophecies authorize us to conclude that the divinity of Jesus and of His supreme work, the Church, is incontestable. This conclusion is the more firmly impressed upon us that several of these prophecies were made in *direct* confirmation of Our Saviour's mission; as, for example, that announcing the Resurrection. "An evil and adulterous nation," says Jesus, speaking of the Pharisees and the unbelieving Jews who sought to ensnare Him in His speech, "seeketh a sign, and a sign shall not be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights, so shall the Son of man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights." Also the prophecies relating to the treason of Judas and the persecution the Church was to endure. "I tell you before it come to pass," says Our Saviour, "that when it shall come to pass you may believe that I am He" (John xiii. 19).

VI. Sixth Proof.

THE MIRACULOUS ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RELIGION OF JESUS, AND ITS PERPETUAL DURATION THROUGH ALL AGES.

This also is a miracle, but of the *moral* order. Let us explain the meaning of these words: a miracle of the moral order.

The moral world is governed by laws even as the physical. For example, it is a law of the moral world that a vast multitude of men will not change their convictions, habits, and customs in a short time, particularly when their passions, interests, and inclinations unite in opposing such a change.[2]

[1] A. C. Q. xvii. 225.

[2] The laws of the moral order, taken as a whole, constitute what is frequently called the *law of history*. This law enables us to determine

God intervenes in the moral order as well as in the physical in two ways: one is ordinary and simply providential, the other extraordinary and truly miraculous. To constitute, strictly speaking, a miracle of the moral order there must be a real derogation of a certain law of the moral order; a simply providential ordering of events is not sufficient, even though it may be more or less marvellous.

A miracle of the moral order may be defined as an effect produced by human liberty, and derogating a law of man's nature to a degree that requires the immediate and extraordinary intervention of God.

It goes without saying that a miracle of the moral order is usually much more difficult to discern than one of the physical order. Hence, treating with an adversary of bad faith, we should dwell most on miracles of the physical order. It is no less true, however, that, to an unbiassed mind, the establishment and propagation of Christianity, as well as its preservation to the present day, are very real and striking miracles.

1. The Estaelishment and Propagation of Christianity.[1]—A. We must first establish the fact itself of this rapid propagation. But it is so incontestable, supported as it is by so many ancient monuments, profane as well as sacred, that unbelievers themselves do not attempt to deny it; they try only to weaken the effect of it by endeavoring to explain it

in advance, usually with great probability, sometimes with certainty, what, in given circumstances, will be the conduct of individuals or nations left to themselves. It is clear that this idea must not be confounded with that of the moral law, properly so called, which establishes an obligation of conscience: it is a moral law, for example, that we shall not do to another what, if done to ourselves, we should consider an injustice.

[1] See works on Church History; Allies (Formation, etc.); Manahan, B. II.; Hope; Thébaud, S.J., Church and Gentile World, I., ch. 3, 4; II., ch. 9; Broeckart, The Fact Divine; Döllinger, First Age of Christianity and the Church; Parsons, Studies, I., ch. 4; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., vol. i., p. I.; A. C. Q. xix. 57.

by natural causes. Let us quote, however, a few historical texts.

The apostles had not completed their career before St. Paul could write to the Romans: "Your faith is spoken of in the whole world;" and to the Colossians: "The Gospel which is come unto you, as also it is in the *whole world*, bringeth forth fruit and groweth, even as it doth in you." St. Justin, a hundred years after Christ, counted several savage nations among the faithful. "We are but of yesterday," said Tertullian, in his turn, in his Apology to the magistrates of the empire, "and we fill your cities, your islands, your camps, the palace, the senate, the forum: we have left you only your temples. If we were to withdraw from you, the empire would be a desert. . . . Among the Parthians, the Medes, the Elamites, among the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, of Armenia, of Phrygia, of Cappadocia, of Pontus, of Asia Minor, of Egypt, of Cyrenaica, among the various races of the Gætuli, of the Moors, of the populations of Spain, of Gaul, of Brittany, of Germany, everywhere we find the faithful." In the year 112, Pliny the Younger, alarmed at the immense number of Christians in his province, wrote the Emperor Trajan, who had appointed him governor of Bithynia: "The contagion of Christian superstition is not confined to the cities, it has invaded the villages and the country and has taken possession of persons of every age, rank, and sex. Our temples are almost entirely abandoned and the religious ceremonies neglected." "This race of Christians is everywhere," Seneca wrote. Renan himself says, speaking of the rapid spread of Christianity: "In one hundred and fifty years the prophecy of Jesus was accomplished. The grain of mustard-seed which had become a tree began to cover the world."[1]

B. A propagation so rapid, so universal throughout the known world in the space of three centuries could not be

[1] D. R., Oct. 1880 (Truth and Falsehood of Renan's Lectures;) Broeckart, l. c.

a natural event. We shall be convinced of this if we consider the circumstances which accompanied it. Considered from a human point of view, the new religion encountered little more than insurmountable obstacles. It had against it:

1st. The Very Men who Preached it.—They were not orators or philosophers, or men familiar with the secrets of science and diplomacy, but Jews, despised by other nations; Galileans, despised by other Jews; with the exception of St. Paul they were men from the humblest walks in life, poor, uneducated, with nothing to credit them in the eyes of the world, wholly without natural advantages fitted to impress the minds of their hearers. In a word, they had nothing which could accredit their mission to the people, to the priests, to philosophers, to magistrates, to emperors; on the contrary, everything connected with them was of a character to discredit their doctrine and to prejudice the success of their enterprise.[1]

2d. The Doctrine it Taught.—If this doctrine had but favored the passions, its propagation would be more comprehensible; but it was no less opposed to the depraved inclinations of the heart than to the prejudices of the mind. Its mysteries offended man's intellectual pride, and its severe and inflexible morality boldly warred against his corrupt inclinations. What a contrast between the life which the pagans led without remorse and that which the new doctrine imposed upon them! Their modesty must be carried to humility, their meekness and charity to loving their enemies as themselves, to forgiving the greatest injuries, their patience to bearing insults without murmur, their detachment from earthly things even to choosing poverty rather than injustice, their chastity to repelling the very thought of evil, their fidelity to the faith even to martyrdom. Here is what was asked of men who in paganism could satisfy their passions and give themselves up to the most

[1] Thébaud, Church and G. W., I., ch. 3.

shameful disorders, after the example and under the patronage of their gods.

3d. The End it Claimed to Attain.—This was nothing less than to replace the ancient and venerated law of Moses by a new law promulgated by a man whom the synagogue had just condemned to an ignominious death; to destroy throughout the world an idolatry which had reigned for so many ages, an idolatry which had a national character, which was considered as an indispensable social necessity, as forming an essential part of the laws; an idolatry which was connected with every act of public and of private life; an idolatry, finally, which was supported by all human powers, by the strongest and most absolute power which ever existed. And all this was to be replaced by a detested worship, which the grave Tacitus accused of hating mankind, a worship which carried its extravagance so far as to require its followers to adore not only an invisible God, but a Jew condemned, at the demand of the priests and magistrates of His own nation, to an ignominious death.[1]

4th. The Time When it Appeared.—It was the age of Augustus and of Tiberius, that is, one of the most polished and enlightened, but at the same time the proudest and most corrupt; an age when the Roman empire was filled with philosophers, orators, poets, and historians; when Rome had become the mistress of nations, and ruled the world by laws and customs all based upon pagan ideas. The ignorance of the apostles, therefore, had to contend with the learning of the greatest geniuses inflated with the pride of their attainments.

5th. The Violent Persecutions to which it was Subjected from its Birth.—Far from receiving any support from public authority, the new religion was the object of the hatred of the synagogue, of the tyranny of emperors and of kings, of the cruelty of governors and of magistrates, of the

[1] See in Lacordaire's Conferences on the Church the reasons why statesmen and scholars were opposed to the young Christianity.

rage of the priests, the philosophers and the people. From the year 64, when the persecution of Nero broke out, to the edict of Constantine in 313, that is, for two centuries and a half, there were ten general persecutions ordered by emperors, and a large number of local persecutions which took place either in consequence of the edicts remaining unrevoked, or which were excited by the hatred of the governors, the magistrates, and the priests of the idols. And let us not forget that among the crowned persecutors were vaunted philosophers, such as Adrian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius; and there were some who, like Decius and Diocletian, were so prodigal of human blood that they believed they had exterminated the very name of Christian.

Conclusion.—The argument we have just presented is as simple as it is conclusive; it rests upon a striking, undeniable historical truth, which does not need to be proved. It is a well-known fact that before the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius the name of Christian was unknown; paganism reigned as master in a society corrupt in the extreme; the cross, an instrument of punishment reserved for slaves, was a sign of extreme infamy. And yet from the time of Constantine, despite a formidable opposition, despite long and cruel persecutions, the Christianity announced by Jews, obscure disciples of a crucified criminal, triumphed even in Athens and Rome; the cross, transformed into an object of adoration and love, adorned the diadems of monarchs, and became the emblem of honor and of glory among regenerated nations. The miracle is palpable, and we can say with fullest confidence, the finger of God is here. "He," says Chateaubriand, "who could cause a cross to be adored, he, we swear it, can be no other than a God." We are familiar with the celebrated dilemma of St. Augustine: either the religion of Jesus Christ triumphed over all obstacles by force of miracles, in which case we must acknowledge that it is divine; or it was established without miracles, in which case this conversion of the world is the greatest of all miracles.

Our conclusion is further justified by the fact that here again we find in the miracle of this rapid propagation the fulfilment of a miracle of prophecy.[1] In fact Jesus had clearly announced the rapid establishment of His religion. "All power," He said to His disciples, "is given to Me in heaven and on earth; going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world. This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations." (Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20; xxiv. 14.) "If I be lifted up from the earth (that is, after My death on the cross), I will draw all things to Myself" (John xii. 32). "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i. 8).

Objections.—Great have been the efforts of obstinate unbelief to weaken the result of this irrefutable fact.

1st. According to Gibbon and those who have followed him, the spread of the Gospel is naturally explained by the unity of the Roman empire, the universal peace, the building of the military roads, the enthusiasm of the masses for the novel and the marvellous, the need that was felt of a purer morality, the charity of the first Christians, the very persecutions which served to spread rather than to stifle the Christian doctrine.

Answer.—We do not think it our duty to refute one by one these perhaps specious but really inconclusive arguments. Let us only remark generally that there is no explanation imagined by unbelief which is not in manifest contradiction with history, or which does not contradict itself, or take the effect for the cause, attributing the propagation of the Gospel

[1] On the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the universality of the Church see Thébaud, i., ch. 2.

to results which its doctrine had already produced, or at least which are not radically insufficient to explain the effect produced.

We are far from claiming that everything in the path of Christianity was an absolute obstacle. We acknowledge that divine Providence, "which reacheth from end to end mightily and ordereth all things sweetly," made the Roman people the unconscious precursor destined to prepare the way for the new religion. The unity and peace of the Roman empire may have contributed to the diffusion of the faith. But this same unity, this peace, and this facility of communication were incomparably more advantageous to the crowned persecutors than to their defenceless victims. It is evident, moreover, that these things, while they smoothed the path of the Gospel, could not be considered the efficacious cause of its success. As to the alleged attraction, not of a few choice souls, but of multitudes in every part of the globe, who can seriously admit it, particularly when there is question of a religious doctrine preached under the conditions stated above, and imposing upon proud minds, upon men given up to their passions, incomprehensible dogmas and the most rigid morality? Were the masses at that time so powerfully attracted by the loss of worldly goods, of liberty, of life itself? If minds, as it is falsely claimed, were predisposed in favor of Christianity, how was it that the pagans for nearly three centuries pursued and persecuted Christians with inhuman barbarity?

In brief, if there were circumstances which may have favored the propagation of the Gospel, it is very evident that the result obtained bears no proportion to the human means employed. For we must not forget that, according to the hypothesis of naturalism, Jesus was only an ordinary man, a poor unlettered artisan, wholly without human resources; that the disciples whom He gathered about Him were also poor, despised, ignorant men, having no divine mission or supernatural power. Such were the envoys whom this Jew

of Galilee sent throughout the world to substitute for the revered law of Moses a powerful idolatry, a doctrine of his own invention, a doctrine contradicting every inclination of the human heart and opposed to every received social tradition. Imagine such an enterprise undertaken in our own day, when the means of communication are so numerous and so easy; even granting the new apostles all the advantages of eloquence, riches, power—who would venture to predict any success, any lasting success for their mission? Admitting that their doctrine, wholly human and curbing the passions, excited by its novelty the enthusiasm of one or several nations, how long would this enthusiasm last? The study of the human heart and of history proves that such reformations are very short-lived; they last as long as passions and interests can profit by the doctrinal novelty.[1]

2d. Islamism and Protestantism were also very rapidly propagated.

Answer.—No comparison is possible here. Every one knows that Islamism, a sensual religion authorizing the gratification of the most brutal passions, was propagated by the sword, while Christianity, proscribing all vices, and pardoning nothing to human weakness, was propagated despite the violence and persecution to which it was subjected. Hence Pascal says: "If Mahomet adopted a human means of success, that adopted by Jesus was a human means of perishing; and instead of concluding that, since Mahomet succeeded, Jesus could succeed, we must recognize, on the contrary, that if Mahomet succeeded, Christianity could not but fail unless sustained by divine aid."[2]

[1] Thébaud, Ch. and Moral W., ch. 4; D. R., Oct. 1880, Renan's lectures.

[2] On *Islamism* see Newman, Hist. Sketches, I.; Schanz, II., ch. 6; Parsons, Studies, I., ch. 37; Alzog, Ch. Hist., II.; Allies, Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood, ch. 6; Lilly, Ancient Religion, ch. 3; The Claims of Christianity, ch. 3; D. R. Old Ser. vii. 78, April '78, Oct. '93. On *Buddhism* see below, p. 276.

As to Protestantism, we have only to consult history to find: 1st. That it was not a new religion, but, under pretext of reform, an open revolt against Catholicism, which had existed for fifteen centuries; further, that it was as much a political as a religious movement; 2d. That its votaries were attracted by riches, and by the laxity it introduced in morals and discipline; 3d. That many human elements favored its development; 4th. That to retain what it had acquired it was obliged to have recourse to the most odious and implacable measures of proscription against the Catholic Church.[1] Read in connection with this subject what we say in the second part of this work in the chapters relating to Protestantism and intolerance.[2]

2. The Miracle of the Continual Preservation of Christianity.—The religion founded by Jesus Christ and preached by the apostles under the most unfavorable circumstances, not only could not be implanted in the world without the assistance of God, but it could not be preserved to us without a manifestly divine intervention.

History in hand, we have frequently traced the various causes of decadence and ruin which would have completely effaced Christianity had it been other than a divine work. We cannot do more than briefly enumerate here the unceasing and terrible combats recorded in the annals of the world.

The Church of Jesus Christ, as P. Ollivier says in his beautiful conference on the establishment of Christianity, had hardly risen, before paganism unsheathed its sword against her—a double-edged sword which it wielded for three centuries; only at the end of the third century did it fall dulled and powerless. Persecution was followed by the still more formidable trial of heresies and schisms, further complicated

[1] Spalding, J. L., lect. 11, 12; Lilly, Claims, etc., ch. 6; Parsons, Studies, III., p. 326 ff.; Alzog, Ch. Hist., III., § 334; Spalding, Prot. Reform., I., p. II., ch. 4; Balmes, ch. 10; Br. W. x.

[2] Lacordaire, conf. 4 on Jesus Christ.

by the dismemberment of the empire under the assaults of barbarians, and by the struggle with barbarism for liberty and civilization. Then rose Mahometism, which, encircling Europe with an iron girdle, sought to crush her in its powerful grasp. Peace itself did not free the Church from trials: the rulers of the age, abusing the influence which the protection of the Church accorded them, created in her bosom simony and corruption; they went so far as to subjugate the Papacy, forcing it to transfer its see from Rome to Avignon. There came finally the last trial, the most formidable of all and which has lasted to the present day: the insurrection and apostasy of Christian nations. Long prepared by the Cathari, the Waldenses, and the Albigenses, resisted by a crusade and by the efforts of the sons of St. Francis and St. Dominic, the insurrection gathered new strength from the rash ambition of Philip le Bel, from the great schism of the East, and the attempts of Wickliff and Huss. Later, under the powerful impetus of Luther, it broke like a tempest over the Church of Jesus Christ. To accomplish its work, it assumes, at need, all forms, it takes all names, it exhausts all means. As Protestantism it combats with pen and sword; as the Revolution it organizes noyades and erects scaffolds; as Philosophy it is lavish of sarcasm and calumny; as an armed and brutal power it invades the pontifical domains and lays its sacrilegious hands on the Vicar of Jesus Christ. "The dream of Philosophy," wrote a modern publicist, "was to overthrow the Papacy, for it appreciated that there was the head, there was the heart of Catholicism. If it could die, this head, this heart must be the point of attack. The Papacy destroyed, Philosophy gained its cause. The Revolution came; it knew the word of command; it aimed at the heart; it dragged the Pope into exile; he died there!" These are the facts as history presents them. Yet what happened! While schools of philosophy, religious sects, kingdoms, empires, in a word, all human institutions have successively fallen and disappeared, even when everything seemed to favor

them, the Church has stood steadfast in the midst of the ruins accumulated about her; she has even come forth purer and stronger from the trials which Providence permitted her to meet in her passage through the centuries. Thus the words of St. Augustine are truly verified: "The Church may suffer, but it is not given any human power to prevail against her: *impugnari potest, expugnari non potest.*"

Remarks.—To these facts, so conclusive of themselves, let us add two remarks which will make their value more appreciated.

1st. Not only has the Catholic Church existed for nineteen centuries, but it has always remained the same: it has preserved the same doctrine, the same constitution, the same form of government, the same discipline, the same worship. This is a unique and incomparable fact. It is the more marvellous that if governments, even those which seem most stable, succeed in preserving an existence of a few centuries, it is only by means of concessions and compromises, only by making the constitutions and the laws yield to the demands of the times. It is quite otherwise with the Church: she has always been inflexible and has remained immutable in all that is essential to her.

This perpetuity of the work of Christ was predicted several times in the most formal manner. "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world," said Jesus to His disciples when He sent them to preach the Gospel. And what was to be the result of this assistance? "Thou art Peter," He said to him whom He made the chief of His apostles, "and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell," that is, the powers of darkness, persecution, snares, "shall not prevail against it" (Matth. xvi. 18). "In the world you shall have distress," He tells all His apostles; "but have confidence, I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33). Here again we meet a double miracle, that of prophecy and that of its fulfilment.

CONCLUSION.—From all that we have stated in this paragraph flows an evident conclusion. If the Church had been a human work, it would long since have ceased to exist except in the minds of men. Time alone would have destroyed it; for time, a celebrated diplomat has said, is the great enemy. Since the Catholic Church (we shall prove in the second part of our work that the religion of Jesus is identical with her) has vanquished time, which destroys all things, if she still stands, ever deriving new vigor from combat itself, it is the arm of God which has sustained her through all ages. To draw this consequence we have only to place side by side the two palpable, incontestable facts mentioned: on the one hand, the fact of the rapid propagation of Christianity and of its preservation to the present day; on the other, that of the *absolute impotence* of the human means at the disposition of the new religion in its struggle with such powerful and numerous enemies. Nothing more than common sense is required in order to recognize that such effects are not the result of the wisdom or power of man, but require *the all-powerful intervention of God.*

VII. SEVENTH PROOF.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MARTYRS.[1]

To appreciate the force of the argument in favor of the divinity of our faith afforded by the testimony of the martyrs it is important to consider:

1. THE VERY LARGE NUMBER OF THESE MARTYRS.—From Nero to Constantine, that is, during two and a half centuries, Christianity was the object of the most terrible persecutions.

[1] On the *early persecutions* of the Church read Church History; also Acts of the Early Martyrs, by Fastre, S.J.; Gleason, I.; Manahan; Allies (Formation, II.); Sweeney; Marcy; Craig; Parsons, Studies, I., ch. 3; Burnet (Why, etc., ch. 13); D. R. New Ser. x. 362, xvi. 85; C. W. xxii. 104; A. C. Q. v. 468. On *modern* persecutions see references below, P. II., ch. 4, art. 1.

A very large number of men courageously shed their blood either during the ten general persecutions or during the unceasing local persecutions. The Emperor Diocletian, following in the footsteps of his predecessor, employed such severe measures against the Christians that he flattered himself that he had exterminated them; witness the inscription on the medal which he had struck: *Nomine Christianorum deleto* (the Christian name has vanished).

2. The Diversity in their Condition.—Masters and servants, rich and poor, men and women, children and old men, soldiers, nobles, philosophers, all vied with one another in their generous ardor to confess the faith of Jesus Christ.

3. The Barbarity of their Torments.—They were so numerous that entire works have been written upon the various kinds, and the simple enumeration of the tortures inflicted upon the Christians fills us with horror; they caused the most exquisite pains, says Tacitus. Seneca, after enumerating some of the terrible tortures, adds that the martyrs endured all that human barbarity could invent.

4. The Manner in which they Bore these Torments.—They were gentle and calm in the midst of the most excruciating suffering. Nothing in their bearing suggested fanaticism or frenzy or a spirit of vengeance; on the very scaffold and at the stake they prayed for their executioners.

5. The Striking Miracles which took place at the execution of these men who were put to death out of hatred of Jesus Christ, whose divinity they proclaimed.

6. The Happy Fruits of the Martyrdom of the Christians.—The number of conversions wrought by these triumphant deaths must have been very numerous to enable Tertullian to write: "The more they slay us the more we multiply: the blood of the martyrs is the seed of new Christians." The unalterable peace and joyful serenity which shone on the brow of the martyr in the midst of the most appalling tortures frequently caused the executioners and

the tyrants themselves to embrace the faith of their victims. Upon all these facts we shall consult with profit a general history of the Church.

Conclusion.—It follows from this testimony of the martyrs that the religion for which they laid down their lives is truly divine. In fact,

1st. So many martyrs of all ages, sexes, and classes of society, in every part of the world and all at the same period, could not have endured with heroic patience, not a speedy and comparatively painless death, but the most prolonged and refined tortures, if God had not *manifestly sustained them*, and consequently if their faith had not been divine. Moral strength of this kind does not belong to human nature. Let us not forget that their sufferings were purely voluntary; to escape them they had only to apostatize.

2d. Before every tribunal in the world, when there is question of facts, proof by testimony is admitted, for facts can be proved only by testimony. Now the martyrs died, not to defend speculative opinions, but to attest the fact of Christian revelation, that is, of the divine mission of Jesus Christ, supported by the Messianic prophecies, by the miracles He wrought, by His life, His superhuman death, His Resurrection, His Ascension, the descent of the Holy Ghost, the miracles of the apostles, etc.: all this forms an essential part of our religion. Men have been known to die for false opinions, believing them true, but never for tenets which they doubted or which they knew to be false. Therefore the Christian martyrs must have had very strong proof of the divinity of their religion; they must have been profoundly convinced of the facts upon which it is based, since they sacrificed everything, even life itself, to obtain the blessings which this religion promised them. When we find the apostles laying down their lives to attest the facts of which they had been ocular witnesses; when we find innumerable Christians of the first century shedding their blood for the faith which they had freely embraced, we have reason to say with Pascal, "I can readily

believe the histories, that is, the historical facts which witnesses attested with their lives."

OBJECTIONS.—In order to weaken the force of the argument derived from the testimony of the martyrs, it has been said: 1st. That the number of the martyrs was not as great as it is claimed; 2d. That the motive of the persecutions was political rather than religious; 3d. That the victims suffered more through fanaticism than conviction.

REPLY TO THE FIRST OBJECTION.—1st. The objection relative to the number of the martyrs originated in the seventeenth century with Dodwell, an English Protestant, a grave historian too; Bayle and other unbelievers have merely reproduced his arguments, prudently refraining, however, from mentioning the refutations of Macknight and Burnet, and particularly that of the learned Benedictine Dom Ruinart. Moreover, Dodwell himself recognizes that the number of the martyrs is great enough to afford a *striking proof* of the divinity of Christianity. This simple acknowledgment may suffice us, as it leaves our argument untouched.

2d. Let us observe, however, that all the arguments of Dodwell are only *negative*, that is, drawn from the silence of other authors, and consequently prove nothing against ours, which are *positive*, that is, supported by authentic testimony. Let us indicate a few of our proofs.

a. Christian tradition has always represented the number of the martyrs as very large. It is the unanimous opinion of the ecclesiastical writers of the first five centuries; in their histories, their homilies, their apologies, their various treatises, they always suppose that the persecutions created martyrs without number. *b*. Tacitus affirms that, under Nero, an immense number of Christians perished. *c*. The historian Eusebius (fourth century) tells us that under Marcus Aurelius the hatred and rage of the people created an *almost infinite number* of martyrs. Among the ten books of the History written by Eusebius there is not one which does not speak of the persecutions enkindled under

the various emperors. In his work entitled "The Deaths of the Persecutors," Lactantius, who lived during the persecutions of Diocletian, Maximus, and Galerius, recalls six emperors whose tragic end seemed to be the effect of divine vengeance. "All the earth," says this same writer, "was cruelly tormented; the East and West, with the exception of the Gauls, were ravaged and devoured by three monsters." *d.* According to tradition, the number of martyrs under Diocletian and Maximus amounted to *two millions*. This persecution was so terrible that these emperors boasted of having exterminated Christianity: *Nomine Christianorum deleto; superstitione Christi ubique deleta*, ran the inscription on their medals. Now, when they ascended the throne, Christianity flourished throughout the empire, hence they must have shed torrents of Christian blood. *e.* It is true that from the year 64 to 313 the Church had frequently years of reprieve, God not wishing, says Origen, the race of Christians to be wholly destroyed; but we know also that in the intervals between the great persecutions the edicts of the emperors were *never revoked;* their execution depended upon the will of the governors of the province, who were not by any means always merciful.

What does the *silence* of writers who were not *obliged* to speak of our martyrs prove against such arguments?

Reply to the Second Objection.—1st. If there is any foundation for this accusation, why is it that neither its authors nor writers in the ranks of unbelievers, offer any serious argument in support of the statement? If it be true, pagan authors of the period, the edicts of the emperors, the replies of the apologists ought to furnish many clear and decisive proofs. No doubt the heads of the empire, who were both rulers and pontiffs, had reason to fear that a change of religion would diminish their power; and history shows that the persecutions were intended solely to prevent the introduction of a new religion, and not the *alleged crimes of the Christians*. "The Emperor Decius," says St. Cyprian, "would

have been less alarmed at a competitor for his throne than at a rival in his *priesthood.*" If the Christians were regarded as enemies to the State, it was exclusively because of their religion, and not because of offences against the government.

2d. St. Justin, Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, St. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and St. Cyprian, in their apologies addressed to the emperors, the magistrates, to all the people, *boldly affirm* that no crime, no sedition, no violation of civil law or public order can be imputed to the Christians; they challenge their enemies to prove the contrary; they reproach the pagans with their severity against the innocent, with putting to death peaceful, law-abiding citizens, enemies of tumult and sedition, who can be accused of no crime but refusing to offer incense to false gods. Now their statement was never denied, their challenge was never accepted.

3d. In addition to this we have the declarations of pagan writers themselves. Tacitus' only charge against the Christians is pernicious superstition: *exitiabilis superstitio;* Suetonius relates that, in the Christians, Nero punished a sect given over to a perverse and hurtful superstition: *superstitionis pravae et maleficae.* Thus the pagans taxed the Christians with impiety toward the gods, which they regarded as the cause of the scourges and public calamities which visited the empire. Celsus, Julian, Libianus, make no other charge against them; Pliny also speaks only of their perverse and excessive superstition: *pravam et immodicam,* he says in his famous letter to Trajan. He declares that he does not know what they punish in the Christians; he is even flattering in his commendation of them, and his praise of their irreproachable conduct is confirmed in the emperor's reply to his letter. We do not speak of vague accusations formulated by one or two pagan authors, in which no crime is mentioned, unless that of infanticide, which accusation we know was based upon a misapprehension of the

Eucharist; but never, despite the challenge of the apologists, was it possible to verify the accusation with a single fact.

4th. The persecuting emperors themselves acknowledged the innocence of the Christians, since the cause of religion was the only motive they alleged in justification of their severe edicts. Diocletian and Maximus, particularly, make no other accusation against the Christians than that of having renounced the worship of the gods. We know that Trajan, in his answer to Pliny, desires that the Christians be punished, but only those who shall be denounced to the tribunals; he forbids the others to be pursued or sought after: this is a tacit declaration of their innocence.

5th. There is, moreover, a very simple means of getting at the truth on this subject. We have only to read the *authentic* "Acts of the Martyrs." Neither in the questions of the examiners nor in the sentence of the judges do we find any trace of proven crime; when they are brought before the tribunals, when they are condemned to death, it is because they refuse to adore the gods, that is, because they are Christians. Finally, here is a proof which may dispense with all the others: in all the persecutions, the accused, to be pardoned, to be laden with honors and rewards, had only to make one act of idolatry. "The Christians," says Origen, "are the only culprits whom the magistrates will dismiss, if they will abjure their religion, offer sacrifice, and take the usual oaths." [1]

Reply to the Third Objection.—We have already replied to it in the preceding remarks. It is truly lamentable

[1] P. Houze, after stating and examining the different causes alleged to have produced the persecutions, concludes that "none of these causes suffices to explain the persecution, and that the true, decisive, and fundamental reason is that given in the forcible language of Bossuet: 'All the senses, all the passions, all worldly interests fought for idolatry. It is the eternal history of the struggle of evil against good. Perverse man would slay, would annihilate all that restrains his passions. Cain slew Abel; the Pharisees slew Christ; the wicked of all ages would slay the Church which is the body of Christ.'"

to find modern unbelief more unjust toward the heroes of Christianity than their very persecutors. It does not hesitate to tax with madness men whose intrepid constancy wrested admiration from the pagans themselves. *Fanaticism* is a favorite expression of unbelievers when they speak of Catholics. It does not dispense them, however, from being logical. In truth, simple common sense tells us clearly enough that there can be no question here of fanaticism, that is, of that conviction unsupported by proof, that blind devotion inspired by passion, limited to time and place. Contemplate this multitude of men and women, youths and maidens, old men and children, as well as converted soldiers, magistrates, philosophers, who, in numerous countries, and for nearly three centuries, endured with the utmost calmness, midst the jeers of the multitude, excruciating, frequently prolonged torments: what indication of passion, of pride, of ambition, of hatred, of vengeance do we find in them?[1] Who can seriously believe that they sacrificed everything, life itself, except for well-grounded convictions? Certainly it was no *present, palpable* end for which they died, hence they could look for the reward of their sacrifice only *beyond the tomb*. But the hope of such a reward necessarily supposes *supernatural faith* supported by the most convincing proofs.

VIII. Eighth Proof.

THE MARVELLOUS FRUITS OF CHRISTIANITY, OR THE WONDERFUL REVOLUTION WHICH IT EFFECTED IN THE WORLD.[2]

This proof founded upon the benefits which the world reaped from Christianity requires much development. We

[1] On the contrast between Christian martyrs and pagan heroes see A. Butler, Lives of the Saints, Dec. 12.

[2] Allies (Formation); Thébaud (Church and Moral World); Balmes' ch. 14; Chateaubriand; Baluffi; Delacroix, Benefits of Religion; Spalding, J. L., lect. 9; Lacordaire, Conf. 21–28, Effects of Cath. Doctrine upon the Soul; Archbp. Hughes, vol. i.; A. C. Q. iv. 389,

shall reserve it for Chapter V. in the second part of our work, where we shall speak of the civilization effected by the Church, and where we shall show that the Catholic Church, that is, true Christianity, has completely transformed the family, the individual, civil society, international relations, the Roman world, and the world of barbarism. Let us confine ourselves for the moment to a few facts, which amply suffice for our purpose.

1. State of the World before Christ.—Let us observe, first, that it is almost impossible for us who live in the light of the Gospel, in the bosom of a society reformed and purified by so many centuries of the Church, to form an accurate idea of the state of the pagan world before the coming of Christ. The grossness of its customs is almost incredible in the present age.

Everywhere, except among the Jewish people, uncertainty and the grossest errors prevailed in regard to the truths most important to man, and which form the basis of intellectual and moral life. Only one nation adored the true God; in every other part of the world men bowed in adoration before the stars, plants, unclean animals, before gods of wood or stone fashioned by their own hands. The world was one vast temple of idols, and, according to the forcible expression of Bossuet, everything was worshipped as God except God Himself. And let us not imagine that the most polished and learned nations were less degraded than the uncivilized world. Persia adored the sun; Egypt its ox, Apis; Ephesus had its great Diana, Delos its Apollo, and Rome, even in its golden age of literature and art, raised to earthly gods, to the most cruel as well as the most infamous, the famous temple (Pantheon: to all gods) which still stands and witnesses with its cross-crowned summit to the victory of Christ over the idols of the world.

We know that public and private morals were in keeping

ix. 358, x. 478, 696, xiii. 405; D. R. New Ser. viii. 456, III. Ser. i. 26; C. W. v. 363. Cf. also references below, P. II., ch. 5.

with such a worship. Man, forgetful of his origin and his sublime destiny, lowered himself to the level of the brute, or, in the delirium of his pride, raised himself to the rank of the gods. Morality having no basis, men lived shameless lives in imitation of the gods themselves. Every passion had its altar. Human dignity, justice, modesty, the most sacred laws were everywhere despised and trodden under foot. Oppression and tyranny ruled in high places, enslaving and degrading the people.

Let us quote a page from Mgr. Gaume, who sums up the painful picture everywhere presented by pagan society (*Histoire de la famille*):

"The bonds of religious society which unite man to God had been broken. Separated from God, man and woman had lost the appreciation of their natural dignity, and had fallen under the despotic empire of sensuality. They had made themselves, after the image of the gods created by their passions, cruel and voluptuous. From their brow had fallen the crown of glory which the hand of the Creator had placed there; blinded by the mist of passions, they had seated themselves in the dust; forgetting what they were, what they should be, they ceased to appreciate their true worth. Hence arose in pagan antiquity man's universal contempt for his fellow being and for himself.

"*Contempt for humanity* prevailed everywhere: for the infant, who was pitilessly strangled, exposed to death, immolated; for the prisoner, who was reduced to slavery, forced to die on the tomb of his conqueror or in the amphitheatre; for the poor, who were driven forth like unclean animals; for the slave, who was laden with chains, overwhelmed with painful labors, thrown as food to the lions and to the tigers, or killed at the caprice of his master; for woman, who was bought, rejected, sold, and dishonored in every way.

"*Man's contempt for himself* was shown by his abuse of his intelligence, which he fed with the most shameful,

the grossest, the most cruel errors, or with vain knowledge, sterile as regarded his true good; of his heart, which he degraded by the most brutal, the most humiliating affections; of his senses, which he prostituted without pity, making them minister to every form of iniquity; of his life, which he did not hesitate to end by the sword or poison, or to sell to whomsoever would possess it, whether to abuse or destroy it.

"*As to society*, it had become, like its members, filled with crime and misery, the strong ever preying on the weak. The State everything, the individual nothing; the citizen, so far from being really free, existed only for the mighty god, the State, whose commands were to be held as just and wise, even though they were the expression of the most flagrant injustice and odious tyranny."

Such was the state of degradation and corruption in which the world was plunged before the coming of Christ. And observe well, the legislators, the poets, the orators, the philosophers never dreamed of doing aught to lift it from the gulf into which it was sinking deeper and deeper. Not unfrequently they were the first to give the example of every vice. Men were so accustomed to the cruel and depraved morality of the age that neither philosophy nor history uttered a protest against these unparalleled disorders, a tenth part of which would revolt any Christian of the present day.

A few philosophers, aided by the light of natural reason, had given utterance to true and elevating conceptions of God, the soul, the true, the good; but their doctrine contained also gross errors upon the essence of the divine nature and the destiny of the human soul. At the same time there existed, even in the best minds, cold and enervating doubt of the most fundamental notions, which necessarily stifled any spirit of propagandism. What could be expected, for example, from a thinker like Cicero, who, after arguing at some length, in his *Tusculanae Disputationes* upon the proofs of the immortality of the soul, lets his pen fall with this dis-

heartening avowal: "How is this accomplished? I know not; but when I read these arguments I am convinced; then when I lay down the book and set myself to reflect, all my conviction vanishes."

At all events, the doctrine of the philosophers, the exclusive possession of a few sages, never reached the masses. While Epicurism hastened the progress of moral corruption, Stoicism, notwithstanding its relative merit, did nothing to arrest it. "Devoid of that proselyting spirit which makes apostles and martyrs, it was incapable of descending to the masses, to revive among them the expiring flame of virtue. Moreover, in preaching the apathy of the sage, and in reducing life to a sad and silent contemplation of events, it destroyed man's interest in the duties of social life and enveloped him in an egotism filled with pride. It produced a few solitary and sterile virtues; it could do nothing for the happiness of humanity, and despotism made the most of this philosophy of despair which abandoned the world to its power."

2. The World after the Coming of Christ.—No one can ignore the marvellous change which was wrought in the world after the cross had been planted on the summit of Calvary. Let us be content to sum up in a few words the principal benefits we owe to Him who proclaimed Himself, with justice, "the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

1st. By means of the new religion which was brought to the world not only the Romans and the Greeks, but even the most barbarous nations, received the light of the Gospel; the grossest classes, those whom ancient philosophy judged unfit for instruction, were enlightened by the torch of truth, and the people acquired, concerning a large number of essential truths, a certainty which the most celebrated philosophers never possessed. These capital truths, which are the solid foundation of all morality, of all virtue, of society itself, were spread throughout the world, and became, so to speak, an integral part of modern society, so that it is

difficult to imagine how it ever existed without them. This, moreover, is one of the characters by which Christ wished us to recognize the divinity of His mission: "the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matth. xi. 5).

2d. Truth begets virtue. In substituting the worship and adoration of the true God in spirit and in truth for the intellectual darkness and secular errors which prevailed in the old world, Christianity gave birth to the virtues which sanctify and honor humanity. We have seen them developed in every age, every clime, and even in the most depraved surroundings; there is no age, no condition, no class of society which, under the all-powerful breath of grace, has not produced marvels of moral greatness and superhuman sanctity.

3d. The influence of Christianity was not confined to the individual sanctification of its members; it purified, moralized the public conscience itself. The heart of the pagan world was vowed to the worship of brute force, and closed by a hard and pitiless egotism to every good and noble sentiment, yet under the softening influence of Christianity it not only acquired respect for law and justice, but the gentle virtues of mercy and charity; the poor, the weak, the suffering, formerly objects of contempt, were respected and cared for. There arose for the solace of every kind of human misery noble institutions, supported by the most sublime devotion.

4th. At the same time, and as it were necessarily, the religion of Christ replaced the pagan legislation, marked by despotism and nameless iniquities, with a new legislation, wholly impregnated with the spirit of its Founder.[1] By its principle of the divine origin of authority it restored the personal nobility of man. Without anarchy it rescued man from the despotic and brutalizing yoke of man, to subject him to Him from whom all power comes. Thus it healed the bleeding and humanly incurable wounds of paganism: slavery, the despotism of the father and husband,

[1] C. W. xiii. 342.

the tyranny of the State, which absorbed the individual, the barbarity of international relations.

Remarks.—To these incontestable facts let us add a few remarks which will make their bearing still more obvious:

a. This marvellous transformation, impossible by merely natural causes, was accomplished in all places where Christianity could be established. Nations, whether pagan or barbarous, savage or polished, old or young, all felt the salutary influence of the evangelical doctrine and of the heavenly grace which accompanies it.

b. Wherever Christianity did not reach, the same state of ancient superstition, of gross idolatry, of profound immorality, continued unmodified. Outside of nations where the cross of Christ is adored we do not find a single people distinguished by its civilization, its laws, its institutions, its customs, by a wisely regulated liberty, by the culture of the arts, the sciences, and letters—in a word, by its moral and intellectual worth.

c. Regions regenerated by Christianity, for example in Africa and Asia, have fallen back into their primitive degradation when they closed their eyes to the light, and for centuries have remained stationary in the darkness to which they voluntarily returned. How great was the former renown of the churches where echoed the voice of Athanasius, of Cyril, of Chrysostom, of Cyprian, of Augustine! Do we not find, moreover, in the very bosom of nations enlightened by revelation that minds fall back into the errors of paganism as soon as they reject the teachings of Christianity?

Conclusion.—Such are the certain facts; here are the necessary consequences. A religion which has effected marvels so completely beyond human power cannot be the work of man; it must come from God.[1] Divine fruits reveal a divine tree, a divine principle. "If we knew nothing of Christianity," says August Nicolas, "neither its doctrine nor its history, if the tree and its roots were completely con-

[1] Picard, p. II., ch. 1.

cealed, and only the fruits apparent to us, we should have been obliged to acknowledge that these fruits are not those which the earth bears, that they are nourished by a supernatural source."

IX. Ninth Proof.

THE DOCTRINAL TEACHING OF CHRIST.

Observation.—All the proofs heretofore stated suffice of themselves to establish the divinity of Christianity, for the reason that they are supported by incontestable miracles, and consequently by the irrefutable testimony of God.

It is otherwise with the two proofs which we are about to state. The great virtue of an apostle and the elevation and purity of his teaching, considered by themselves, do not constitute a completely convincing proof of a divine mission. In truth, hypocrisy and fraud may assume the appearance of true sanctity. Any doctrine whatever, to be accepted by mankind, must be supported by divine works; these works were the more necessary here that the teacher not only proclaimed Himself God's ambassador, but claimed divine honors. Thus Jesus Himself announced this to be necessary when He said: "If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin" (John xv. 24).

At the same time we cannot pass over in silence arguments which, considered in themselves, are very conclusive. If they do not constitute a complete demonstration, they are none the less a distinctive mark of divine revelation. Moreover, by the very fact that they are supported by the preceding proofs they become in their turn incontestable. Furthermore, being very clear and easily apprehended they make a deep and legitimate impression on the majority of minds and prepare them to hear favorably and to study attentively more solid, but perhaps less attractive, reasons.

Here is the reason upon which the ninth proof is based:

It is manifestly evident that the doctrine of Christ in dogma, in moral teaching, and in worship, is of superhuman perfection. This is still more apparent when we consider the circumstances under which it was announced to the world. The doctrine therefore comes from God, and consequently Jesus is God's ambassador.

The doctrine of Our Saviour is almost wholly contained in the gospels. A large part of the teaching given His disciples, either during His life or after His Resurrection, was consigned to the other books of the New Testament or books of tradition. We cannot do more than sketch here the principal points of this doctrine; the development of it belongs to that part of theology called Special Dogma and Moral Theology.

THE DOGMATIC TEACHING OF CHRIST.

A Doctrine of Jesus concerning God.—God is a Being by Himself, without beginning or end, existing from all eternity through the necessity of His nature, and possessing all perfections in an infinite degree; by His almighty power to which nothing is impossible, He has created out of nothing all that exists, and thus He is the principle, the centre, and the end of all things; by His immensity He is completely present in every place, yet cannot be contained in space; He is in us and we are in Him; in Him and through Him we live and move and have our being; nothing can escape His omniscience: the past, the present, the future, the beings purely possible, the future determinations of beings endowed with free will, all are present to the divine thought in an eternal and immutable present. By His providence, as full of wisdom as of love, He watches over all beings, causing them to serve His glory and leading them to the end He has assigned them, unless they voluntarily place an obstacle to His designs. Nothing happens in this world without His order or permission. Not a hair falls from our head without the consent of our heavenly Father. His sanctity regards the smallest iniquity

with the greatest horror. His justice punishes and rewards each one according to his merit: He does not permit a glass of water given in His name to go unrewarded.

What is particularly remarkable here in the teaching of Jesus is the manner in which He dwells upon the mercy and goodness of God. These divine attributes, of which the pagans had not the slightest knowledge, were not, it is true, unknown to the Jews. To them, however, God was particularly the sovereign Master, the all-powerful Lord, to be adored and feared; but to the disciples of Jesus He is, above all, *Goodness by essence*, "God is charity" (1 John iv. 8); He is a tender, compassionate Father, who asks our love, who knows the weakness of His children and has pity on their misery. By His grace, which He has promised never to refuse to their prayers, and by the sacraments which He has instituted in His Church and which are admirably adapted to their needs, He never ceases to strengthen them, and, if they fall, to help them to rise again, and to renew their strength in the path of heaven. God is the Good Shepherd who goes in search of the lost sheep; and when He finds it, tenderly bears it upon His shoulders, sparing it the fatigue of the way. Again, He is the Father of the prodigal son, whom He receives after long years of weary waiting, with unheard-of tenderness, for "there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance" (Luke xv. 7).[1]

[1] We cannot resist the desire to make a remark here; it is somewhat long, perhaps, but we regard it as very important. The thought of this love of God for man, a thought which is the sweetest joy to the heart and the greatest consolation in the trials of life, is of great importance in determining our faith in the mysteries of revelation; for the supreme reason of these mysteries is that which Christ Himself has given us: "God so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son" (John iii. 16). To believe in such a love is to believe in Christianity, which is its result, or rather which is this love itself. Thus the beloved disciple presents us no other motive

To the dogma of the unity of God so clearly taught in the Old Testament, and verified, moreover, by simple reason, Jesus adds others of which the Jews themselves had only a confused and incomplete knowledge. He it was who revealed in an explicit manner the ineffable dogmas of the Holy Trinity, of the Incarnation of the Word, of the Redemption of the world.

Adam had sinned and infinite justice claimed a satisfaction worthy of God's offended majesty. This satisfaction was

of faith: "We have known and have believed the charity which God hath to us; God is charity" (1 John iv. 16); for in order to believe we must *will* to believe.* The will is a necessary part in an act of faith, which is an act of virtue, consequently a free act. The motives of belief which we are stating at present do not, despite their direct and convincing character, render doubt impossible; they make it only unreasonable. Now that which most powerfully determines the will is love excited by love. It was the consideration of the love of God for His creature which decided the conversion of the great and beautiful soul worthy to be praised by Bossuet. The Palatine princess to whom he refers in his funeral oration of Anne de Gonzague was so wholly without faith that to convince her of the truth of Christianity would be, as she declared, the greatest of miracles. Yet this miracle took place. How did faith enter a soul so firmly closed against it? "When it pleased God," she says, "to put in my heart the thought that *His love is the cause of all we believe*, it convinced me more than all the books I had read. One can, in fact, readily believe that a God who loves infinitely gives proofs proportioned to the infinity of His love and proportioned to the infinity of His power, which far exceeds the capacity of our weak reason." This explains the Incarnation, the Redemption, and the cross of Our Saviour; it explains the sacraments, and particularly the adorable Eucharist, where Christ, great as He is, carries His love for us so far as to become the Companion of our exile, our Food, and our Victim (John xiii. 1; Gal. ii. 20). This explains the touching introduction of the prayer which Our Saviour taught His apostles: "Our Father, who art in heaven." The Lord's Prayer, properly understood, suffices of itself to show the superiority of Christianity over all religions of human origin.

Let us add a remark which will make what we have said still better

* Ward, W., The Wish to Believe.

given, but where "sin abounded grace did more abound." God created all things by His Word; and by this same Word He restored all things. God imprinted His likeness in man at the moment of his creation. He went so far as to assume our likeness to raise us more efficaciously from our degradation. Thus God not only did not abandon humanity after the fall of the first man, but He drew good from evil, and by a miracle of love, greater than that of the creation, and than that of our elevation to the supernatural order, He contracted with humanity an ineffable union, the highest and most intimate union possible. The Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Son, in all things equal to the Father and

understood. Faith consists in cleaving to God and to His word; it is a joyful and trustful abandonment of our judgment to the divine intelligence. Convinced of the infallible wisdom of God, imbued, above all, with His ineffable tenderness for us, we have no desire to analyze the motives of our faith. We are like a child who relies with absolute confidence on the words of his father, not only because his father possesses knowledge which he is without, but because he knows that his father loves him and finds his happiness in teaching him the truth. The devils have unalterable faith; they believe revealed truths with absolute certainty, but their faith is a cold, rational deduction. Very different is the faith of the children of God. It is not the result of cold, metaphysical infallibility; it is, if it may be so expressed, a loving and beloved infallibility to which they cleave. They know that if, by any possibility, God could be deceived, He would not deceive His children, because they are His children and He is their Father, and He wishes to give them Truth as the first of all blessings, and the foundation of all others. The knowledge of this disposition on the part of God excites confidence in the faithful, and confidence begets faith, a loving allegiance of the children of God to the word of their Father, who speaks to them in love in order to put them in possession of the truth. What we have just said serves also to explain why sincere study is not sufficient to lead heretics or unbelievers to the faith; prayer must be added to study, because, in addition to supernatural light, it obtains the grace which makes them love truth and its Author, and cleave joyfully to the word of Our Father in heaven.*

* Ward, l. c.; Manning, Internal Mission of H. Gh., ch. 3; Newman, Discourses to Mixed Congr., 9, 10.

the Holy Spirit, was united hypostatically, that is, in unity of person, to a human nature like our own in all respects save sin. Through His human nature Jesus could suffer and die; through His divine nature He imparted infinite value to His expiatory sufferings. Thus there was offered to the offended majesty of God a reparation worthy of His supreme greatness. Thus justice and mercy were reconciled.

B. Doctrine of Jesus Christ concerning Man.—This doctrine is neither less admirable nor less touching than that concerning God. Created to the image of the Most High, and adorned at once with sanctifying grace which imparts to him supernatural life and a sort of participation in the life of God Himself, man's sublime mission was to know, to love, and to serve in this world his Creator and Father. In fulfilling this duty so necessary, so glorious for man, so perfectly conformable to reason, he was sure of attaining his supreme destiny, that of enjoying in heaven the full possession of God, of sharing his infinite happiness for all eternity.

God's will was that this original justice, this sanctifying grace which made the first man most pleasing to Him, should pass to his posterity; but Adam could transmit it only on condition of preserving it himself by his fidelity to his Creator. On the other hand, the inheritance of heaven being assigned him as a glorious reward of his free obedience, it was needful that this obedience be put to the test. God therefore addressed a prohibition to Adam with a formal command to respect it. The observance of this command, which, moreover, was light, was to be an acknowledgment of God's sovereign dominion, an authentic proof of the creature's free submission to his Creator, of the child to his father. Our first parents disobeyed, and in punishment of this voluntary abuse of their liberty they were deprived of the grace which constituted the supernatural life of their souls and rendered them pleasing to God.

Adam, in losing through his own fault the state of justice

and original innocence, found it impossible to communicate it to his posterity, who, by the free disposition of God, had been made dependent on the head of humanity for *supernatural* as well as natural life. Thus a father ruined by play, or outlawed by an act of treason, cannot transmit his title and fortune to his children. And as, according to the beneficent will of God, each man was to be born with the dignity of son by adoption, adorned with sanctifying grace, the privation of these special relations of friendship is a veritable forfeiture which, resulting from a culpable act, makes unregenerated man an object of aversion to God.[1]

This prevarication of our first parents has been the cause of all the evils from which humanity suffers. It explains the mystery of sorrow and of death, which has been and always will be the despair of the philosophy which rejects faith.[2] The loss of sanctifying grace entails the loss of other supernatural gifts, as well as of preternatural or extranatural prerogatives which God had generously attached to this grace. These magnificent privileges, which are not required by our nature, but which constitute its integrity, were, especially, immortality, exemption from suffering, infused knowledge, and the subjection of the body to the soul, of the

[1] According to the teaching of theology that which is transmitted to us by generation is evidently not the personal or actual sin of Adam, that is, the act by which he transgressed the precept of the Lord; but it is the state resulting from the severance of the relations of supernatural friendship for which God had gratuitously predestined Adam and, through him, all his posterity. This privation of the sanctifying grace which was to make us the children of God being the consequence, not of personal sin, but of the infidelity of the head of the human race, those who die in original sin only will not, it is true, enjoy the beatific vision, but they will be in no way subject to the pains of sense. This is the opinion of St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, Innocent III., and many other theologians. See also below, P. II., ch. 4, art. 1, IV.

[2] On the *Existence of Evil* see Boedder, Nat. Th., B. III., ch. 2; Hunter, II., n. 388 ff.; I. E. R. Oct.–Nov. '99.

appetites to reason. Sin entailed the loss of these advantages. Man found himself thenceforth condemned to know death, to be subject to ignorance, to infirmity, to disease, and to miseries of all kinds. The harmony which existed in the beginning between the superior and inferior faculties gave place to a warfare which every one feels within his breast; man, having criminally withdrawn from the obedience which he owed to God, beheld, by a just return, his passions rebel against reason, the flesh unceasingly revolt against the spirit instead of following its light; thus virtue, which was formerly sweet and easy, became for us an object of noble but laborious strife. We see that the evils with which we are overwhelmed are not the work of God, but the work of man, who did not preserve the prerogatives with which he was endowed.

But human nature has not been deprived of anything essential to it; this is the teaching of the Church in contradiction to Protestants and Jansenists. Let us further bear in mind that God could, without injury to His justice or His goodness, have created man as he is to-day, for his state meets all the needs of his nature, his condition and character as a reasonable being.

Appeased by the blood of His Son, God, as we have said, gave man the right to recover the sanctifying grace which permits him to call God his Father, and gives him a claim to the inheritance of heaven. This grace, the principle of supernatural life, is offered to man not only in its original fulness, but in greatest abundance (John x. 10). At the same time man preserves the power of refusing this signal benefit, for he preserves free-will, a condition of merit. If he is guilty of this insensate and criminal ingratitude, if he obstinately repels the advances of divine mercy which unceasingly invite him to repentance and offer him pardon, he can attribute his eternal loss only to himself. If he accepts with gratitude this gift, bought at an infinite price, it is through the grace of God that he will merit the promised reward, participation in the infinite happiness of the

divinity itself. "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. xv. 10).

C. DOCTRINE OF JESUS CHRIST CONCERNING THE WORLD.—In creating out of nothing the universe which surrounds us, God, the infinitely Wise, the only Being existing from all eternity, must necessarily have had in view an end worthy of Himself, His own glory. Now glory is an honorable name, accompanied with praise. The material world is evidently incapable of itself of glorifying God. It is for man, a reasonable creature, to procure Him this glory by contemplating and praising the power, the wisdom, the goodness, in a word, all the divine perfections which shine forth in the entire creation. Again, this praise would, like man himself, be limited if the Son of God had not carried His love so far as to clothe Himself with our nature and dwell among us (John i.). Through Jesus Christ the Divinity received from man perfect homage truly worthy of God. Thus through the intermediary of man, who is, as it were, an abridgment of the world, material beings glorify their divine Author, and through the organ of the incarnate Word this glory is truly infinite: one act of adoration of the Word made flesh glorifies the Creator much more than could millions of worlds peopled by the most sublime creatures. Man, in return for the praise which he renders God, will receive a hundredfold of happiness, for the glory of God is intimately connected with the happiness of His privileged creature. All that is contained in created nature, the triple reign of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, is designed by Providence as a means of helping us to accomplish our present mission and to attain our eternal destiny. It is the same with the events of each day, whether propitious or unpropitious, public or private, ordained or permitted by God. All miseries, whether physical or moral, the consequence of sin, have ceased, in virtue of the Redemption, to be sterile or without hope; they remain a chastisement, but it depends only on man to make them a

means of expiation, a source of merit, a claim to the conquest of the most brilliant crown, of a high place in heaven. "To them that love God, all things work together unto good" (Rom. viii. 28). "The sufferings of this life are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come" (Ib. 18).

THE MORAL TEACHING OF CHRIST.

It is impossible to imagine anything more perfect than the moral law imposed by Christ. Even the most impious are forced to acknowledge this. After Strauss, who unhesitatingly affirms that "the moral teaching of Christ is the foundation of human civilization," and that "the Jesus of history is a type of moral perfection," Renan declares that "the teaching of Jesus is the most beautiful moral teaching which humanity has received. . . ." "Each one of us," he further says, "owes to it all that is best in him. . . . The Sermon on the Mount will never be surpassed." At the same time that this law traces, with marvellous clearness, all the obligations of man toward God, toward himself, toward the family, and toward society, it proscribes not only every crime and every fault, but even the desire and the voluntary thought of evil. Not content with confirming the practice of all that is commanded by the natural law, it invites us to the practice of the highest and most perfect virtues, of the evangelical counsels of chastity, poverty, and voluntary obedience, sublime virtues unknown to the world, of which the name alone must fill it with amazement.

The ideal, the model of the perfection which Christ proposes to each one of us is no other than the perfection of God Himself: "Be you therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matth. v. 48).

To help us to imitate this perfection the Son of God appeared to us under a human form, thus offering us a divine model in Himself. Hence we have only to reproduce in our souls the virtues which Christ has taught us by example and by precept: "For I have given you an example, that

as I have done to you, so you do also" (John xiii. 15). Every Christian, according to the forcible expression of Tertullian, must be another Christ: *Christianus alter Christus;* he must be able to say with St. Paul: "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me."

To us who are Christians, brothers of Christ, God is in a special manner a Father full of love, of goodness, and of mercy; hence it is not astonishing that He requires His children to be specially distinguished by the practice of these virtues. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind; this is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments dependeth the law and the prophets." (Matth. xxii. 37–41.) In declaring to us that He came to enkindle the fire of His love, and that there is nothing that He desires so much as to see hearts more and more inflamed with this divine fire, Jesus refers constantly, and in the most persuasive terms, to the necessity of this compassionate charity for our neighbor, that is, for all men without exception; for before God, as St. Paul tells us, there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: all are one in Christ Jesus. This, He tells us, is His favorite commandment, the mark by which we shall recognize His disciples, as well as an infallible means of pleasing Him and of acquiring innumerable merits: "All that you do to the least of these My brethren I shall regard as done to Myself."

Jesus knows that many of these lessons are difficult to our fallen nature. Far from concealing this, He declares openly that the kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and that he who would follow Him must renounce himself and daily carry his cross. But at the same time, to stimulate our courage, He assures us that His yoke is sweet and His burden light to those who bear it generously; that the observance of the commandments here below is the only true and solid good,

the only means of procuring peace of soul (Matth. xi. 29); and He unceasingly holds before us the eternal and infinite rewards which God has prepared for those who love Him. And as the fear of punishment is needful to keep us from the abyss whither our passions constantly lead us, Jesus, who desires to save us at any price, speaks fourteen times in appalling terms of an eternal hell, and He places before us this unanswerable argument: "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?" Finally, to these motives, which of themselves so powerfully persuade us to persevere in the path of virtue and happiness, Jesus adds another, purer, and more worthy of great souls: the love of God, which enkindles and ennobles all virtues.

Moreover, in this painful warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil we are not alone and dependent upon our own strength. He who unceasingly watches over each one of His children has prepared for them supernatural, most efficacious, and superabundant means by which they may be ever victorious over their enemies; the very power of God has been placed at the disposition of their weakness. Among the means of obtaining divine grace, prayer and the sacraments hold the first place. Prayer, a means as honorable as it is easy, not only places us, as often as we will, in intimate communication with "Our Father, who is in heaven," but is, as Our Lord has promised, *infallibly efficacious*.[1] As to the sacraments, which are adapted to all conditions and all circumstances of life, they confer grace of themselves upon souls in whom they meet no obstacle. This is particularly true of the Sacrament of Penance, which, by means of sincere repentance and a humble confession made under the seal of the most inviolable secrecy, remits all sins whatever their number and enormity.[2] It is still more true of the adorable Eucharist, marvellous invention of the love of Him who,

[1] Ward (Theism), II.; A. C. Q. viii. 577, xi. 491; C. W. xii. 816.

[2] De Goesbriand, History of Confession; Melia, Auricular Confession; Wiseman, Lectures on the Doctrines of the Church; Hunter, III., tr. 19; D. R. New. Ser. xxxi. 122.

unwilling to leave us orphans, found means of returning to His Father without ceasing to dwell among us. Under the species or appearances of bread and wine, Jesus Himself dwells in all tabernacles as truly as He was present in the manger and on the cross. In this humble abode He urges us to come to Him for strength and consolation; He unceasingly renews, in an unbloody manner, the sacrifice of Calvary, perpetually offering Himself as victim to His Father for the sins of the world; finally, by an admirable extension of His Incarnation, He deigns to unite Himself in the most real and intimate manner to all who receive Him in holy communion, clothing them with His divine strength, and imparting even to their bodies the germ of a happy immortality.[1]

He, therefore, who fails to realize the end of his creation and of his elevation to the supernatural order can attribute his loss only to himself. He is like a poor man who voluntarily dies in want and misery with an inexhaustible treasure at hand completely at his disposition.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST CONCERNING WORSHIP.

Christ's doctrine of worship is in perfect harmony with His teaching concerning God and man.[2] God being spirit wills to be *adored in spirit and in truth;* man being also spirit, as regards his soul, owes God a spiritual homage, that is, the homage of his intelligence and his will: this worship, then, must, above all things, be interior. But as man is also matter, and his body no less than his soul is God's creature, he must add to the interior homage of his will the exterior worship of his body. Finally, being a social being and indebted to God for all the advantages he derives from intercourse with his fellow beings, he is bound to honor God not only as an individual, but as a social being; hence he owes

[1] Humphrey, Sacrifice and Sacraments; Hunter, l. c., tr. 18.

[2] On *Catholic Worship* see references below, P. II., ch. 2, art. 2, II.

God a public worship. This triple homage, freed from all the cruel, superstitious practices of pagan worship, as well as the minute, local details of the worship prescribed to the Jews by Moses for a special end, is the most sublime, the purest, the most worthy of God, as well as the most fitting for man.[1]

General Remarks.—The following considerations will manifest still more clearly the marvellous character of Christ's teaching concerning God, the world, man, morality, and worship.

1. We have seen that the greatest unbelievers themselves are forced to recognize the intrinsic perfection of Christ's moral teaching and its incomparable superiority to all the philosophic or religious teaching which the world has ever received. Minds never cease to be impressed with its fulness, its purity, its sublimity, and its efficacy. See in Part II., ch. 5, art. 3., Jouffroy's opinion of the Catechism, which is only an abridgment of the evangelical truths. Read also on p. 150 what we have quoted from Rousseau and where he speaks in truly admirable terms of the Gospel. A fragment from this same author has recently been found, in which his admiration is still more explicitly expressed; all it lacks is a sincere acknowledgment of Christ's divinity. Similar tributes or acknowledgments have come from Strauss, Renan, and others.

2. At the time when Our Saviour appeared polytheism was almost universal; the grossest errors, the most ridiculous or the most cruel superstitions prevailed everywhere; the grand ideas of one eternal God, of a spiritual soul endowed with immortality, of a fatherly and merciful providence, of a life to come, of the fall and the restoration of man, almost unknown to the masses, were frequently, even to the greatest minds, dark, and disheartening mysteries. At the same time, and as a necessary consequence, all virtues, even the

[1] Br. W. v. 270, viii. 324.

most indispensable, were banished from the world, and in their place reigned every vice, personified in the deities whom men worshipped. Such was the condition of the world when, suddenly and unexpectedly, the evangelical doctrine, a doctrine which has been the admiration of all ages, appeared in an obscure corner of Judea. No doubt all that is true and just in the teaching of philosophy is clearly and forcibly confirmed in the teaching of Jesus; but the doctrines of the philosophies frequently so erroneous, so varied, so opposite, so barren, are much more frequently contradicted than approved in the Gospel. No doubt again, the Gospel is the crown and perfection of the Mosaic law. Moreover, the Jews so little expected and were so little prepared for this perfection that the whole nation protested that they did not acknowledge it; they did more, they crucified its Author.

3. And this teaching, so wonderful in itself, but still more wonderful when we consider the period in which it appeared, fell from the lips of an *obscure artisan* of Galilee, who had lived hitherto by the labor of His hands, ignorant of letters and philosophy, and who belonged to none of the sects to which Judea was then a prey. These circumstances were fully known to the Jews whom Jesus taught. "How," they said, "can this man know letters, having never learned?" (John vii. 15.)

4. Jesus' manner of teaching was no less remarkable. He does not argue or discuss with His hearers; He does not speak like the Scribes or Pharisees, "but as one having power" (Matth. vii. 29). They felt as they listened to His words that the profound mysteries which filled them with awe and wonder were familiar and simple matters to Him. Thus the astonished multitude exclaim: "Never did man speak like this man." And yet nothing equals the touching simplicity of this teaching. The language of the Sage par excellence is most natural and simple; there is no attempt at eloquence, no extravagant flights

of fancy, and His words are adapted to the simple intelligence of His hearers, for it is particularly to the poor and the humble, to simple upright souls that He is pleased to reveal the secrets of His wisdom. His dogmatic teaching, sublime in itself and rigidly exact in its brevity, is usually expressed in the form of sentences or proverbs easily remembered; or in charming parables which engrave it deeply upon the mind and memory; or more frequently still in admirable similes borrowed from objects familiar to His hearers, or from the events of the moment, or the customs of daily life. Thus we behold the multitude hanging upon His words and following Him for days, insensible of the claims of hunger, even into the desert.[1]

5. Jesus is no less admirable in His intercourse with His adversaries. How frequently the Scribes and the Pharisees endeavored to ensnare Him with artful questions, to make Him contradict Himself or the Law of Moses and thus render Him ridiculous or odious to the people! But the clear, decisive answers of Jesus not only baffle their evil designs, but put them to such confusion that they dare not question Him further.

6. Let us recall what we have said of the marvellous efficacy of this teaching which has transformed the individual, the family, and society. Despite the united resistance of the passions, it founded among men true fraternity, true equality, and true liberty; it softened the morals of the age, it established the unity and indissolubility of marriage, and with it the stability of family life. In a word, it created modern civilization. While the doctrine of Plato, Socrates and others remained almost barren, the teaching of Jesus produced everywhere and in all ages the most admirable virtues, marvels of abnegation, of devotion, and of holiness. Even at the present day we find civilization advancing or retrograding according as it receives or rejects the teachings of Christianity.

[1] Cardinal Wiseman on the Parables of the New Testament.

1st Objection, Drawn from the Points of Resemblance between Christianity and Other Religions.—A primary and more general objection is stated now with great display of erudition in works or public lectures treating of the *History of Religions*. Under this title the enemies of the Church, with equal contempt or indifference, affect to confound the one true religion with the multiplied religious errors with which men have disfigured the divine work. This objection is drawn from the points of resemblance stated to exist between Christianity and the false religions of antiquity. They argue that such resemblance proves that the Christian religion is a simple evolution of earlier creeds, and, like them, of human origin. Though the objection is groundless, we consider it necessary to refute it here because of its existence itself and of the injurious impressions it has produced in many souls. We are obliged to be brief, but to those who care for a fuller development of the subject we would recommend the Abbé de Broglie's *Problèmes et conclusions de l'histoire des religions*. a work from which we have frequently quoted.

Reply.—1st. It is important, first of all, to observe that this objection, like all others from other sources, leaves intact the ten proofs which we have given of the divinity of Christianity. When a truth is solidly established by fitting proofs, no objection is available against it. We are far from denying that there are points of resemblance between the religion of Jesus Christ and false religions; the contrary would be most astonishing, nay, impossible, as we shall prove. But it is no less true that the Christian religion alone offers convincing and numerous proofs of its divinity. Thus, so far from fearing the light, it provokes and solicits conscientious examination; it fears only ignorance and bad faith. The false religions, on the contrary, in whatever form they present themselves, Brahminism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism or Mazdeism, Confucianism, etc., cannot endure for a moment the searching light of reason and the test of knowledge. As

Augustin Thierry said: "In point of religion, it is only Christianity which counts." What matter then the alleged points of resemblance if it remains certain that Christianity alone is divine and binding upon all men?

The justice of our conclusion is strengthened by the fact that among the characteristics of Christianity which clearly manifest its divinity, there are many exclusively its own which bear no analogy whatever to anything in pagan creeds. Where, for example, shall we find anything like the numerous and exact prophecies which for so many centuries prepared the coming of Jesus Christ and were so fully verified in Him? Where shall we find the innumerable, striking, incontestable miracles wrought by Jesus, and by His disciples in His name? What other religion presents such a complete and perfect doctrine concerning God, man, and the relations existing between both? Where is the founder of a religion whose real life, not a legendary life like Buddha's, can be compared to the historical and absolutely perfect life of the Author of Christianity? These striking facts, inseparable from the religion of Christ, clearly manifest that the finger of God is here.

2d. We know that God has never left the world without supernatural light; that there has been a revelation from the beginning. The successive communications of God with mankind, the memory of which must have been perpetuated through the ages, even among pagan nations, suffice to explain many analogies: all religions have necessarily borrowed, more or less, from that common source.

3d. So far from its being difficult to explain the points of resemblance between Christianity and the religions of the East, particularly Buddhism, it can easily be shown that this resemblance must necessarily exist to a certain degree. Human nature, everywhere the same, is essentially religious; in fact man has been defined as a religious animal. Religion is destined to satisfy this instinctive aspiration of the human heart; therefore the different creeds, whatever their origin,

divine or human, must have many points of resemblance. Let us explain our idea by a comparison. Royal palaces of capital cities are for the most part similarly arranged or constructed. In each one we find a throne-room, reception-rooms, private apartments for the sovereign, others for his family and his suite; in all of them we find stairways, ante-chambers, doors, and windows. Can we conclude from this that these palaces were all built by the same architect and on the same plan? By no means. These resemblances come from the fact that the structures are intended for one and the same purpose: to serve as a dwelling for the head of the state. For a similar reason one railway station resembles another, one theatre another. It is the same with social institutions: in all countries deliberative bodies, tribunals, armies have certain points of resemblance, for the reason that they tend to the same end and respond to the same needs.

To apply these comparisons we have only to bear in mind that false religions as well as the true, which alone is endowed with heavenly virtue, are intended to satisfy the religious aspirations of the human heart. Among pagans, as well as among Christians, we find the need of adoration and of prayer, of expiation and of sacrifice, terrors of conscience, a tendency toward the supernatural, fear of invisible beings, aspirations toward a future life. Now, as all religions are intended to respond to these aspirations of the human soul, they must necessarily contain many points of resemblance.

Let us suppose men deprived of the benefit of revelation and a divine religion, what happens? They naturally seek what they lack, and fashion it according to their own ideas. Feeling the need of a revelation, they are naturally disposed to listen to any prophet without even verifying his claims; feeling the need of a redeemer, they give credence to him who declares that he can and will save them; eager for religious emotions, they institute rites, ceremonies, feasts, canticles, calculated to awaken and nourish these emotions; with aspirations toward the supernatural, they address themselves

to invisible beings to obtain for them health and earthly blessings. This explains the existence in all ages of prophets, messiahs, thaumaturges, founders of creeds, inventors of touching ceremonies.

If such, in brief, is the history of the formation of human religions, is it not evident that the divine religion, though very different in essential points, must resemble the others in many respects? Consider the subject more in detail and you will better understand the reason of these analogies.

The dogmas taught by Christianity are, in part at least, truths which reason of itself can attain. If revelation has added to the treasure of natural truths, it has first enlarged and perfected the knowledge of these truths of the natural order; it has made them more accessible to the mass of mankind, and imparted to them a clearness and certainty which the unaided reason too frequently is powerless to give. Is it astonishing to find in the teaching of reason certain dogmas which recall points of evangelical doctrine?

It must needs be the same with Christian morality, since, at bottom, it is only the natural law developed and supernaturalized, illumined with a new light, and enlarged with the addition of certain prescriptions imposed by God. Why, therefore, should we not find in false religions certain moral precepts analogous to those of the true religion?

The man who feels in himself appetites condemned by conscience, readily understands that to secure the triumph of the spirit over the flesh he must wage war against the pleasures of the body, accustom this body to suffer. He sees also in this suffering a means of appeasing the Divinity, which his guilty weakness has offended. Then there follows naturally a moral tendency to mortification of the passions, to fasting, to voluntary, self-inflicted, bodily suffering. We must find, then, in the purer religions a tendency to lead a life of austerity fitted to conquer the evil inclinations of nature, and to employ for this end the means indicated by nature. Why should not the Buddhist monks, for example, in order to

become more perfect, employ means analogous to those in use among the ascetics and religious of Catholicism?

As to exterior worship, which is only the outward expression of the hidden sentiments of the soul in regard to the divinity, it is quite natural that it should bear great analogy among the different religions. Man's object in this worship is to express to God his respect, his adoration, his submission, his gratitude, and obtain from Him blessings and the pardon of his offences. What will he do, then, but have recourse in his worship to the means which his reason, his imagination, his sentiments, and the nature which surrounds him suggest and afford? Why should not the true religion employ the same means? Why, for example, should the Christian religion have abstained from the use of incense, from the burning wax, from religious canticles, from music, from genuflections, from prostrations, from sacrifice—in a word, from all that is fitted to express the acknowledgment of God's sovereign dominion over His creatures, to implore His help or His pardon, to maintain the fervor of religious sentiments in the human heart? Is not this restoring creatures to their true and highest destiny, and re-establishing the rights of God?

The justice of this conclusion is more evident when we consider that God, in prescribing by means of revelation an exterior worship, must, in His wisdom and goodness, make it in harmony with the tendencies and the necessities of the nature with which He has endowed us. Nay, it was part of His wisdom and goodness to take into account what man had found of himself, what made the deepest and most lasting impression upon him, and even, in a certain measure, religious customs hallowed by time, and thus facilitate the accomplishment of the duties He prescribed. In prescribing to Moses the rites, the ceremonies, and the feasts of the law without obliging the Hebrews to renounce completely their religious customs, God acted as a tender and provident Father. In her turn, the Catholic Church, charged by her

divine Founder to determine the religious practices other than the sacraments, and to regulate the details of worship, was not obliged to set aside the lawful custom of converts that came to her either from Judaism or paganism. Heir of the Old Law, it was just that she should borrow a part of its rites and ceremonies. As to customs, good or indifferent in themselves, of human religions, would she not have preserved them, only purifying and sanctifying them by referring thenceforth to the Creator what had served in the worship of creatures? Why should she have suppressed all pagan festivals? Was it not sufficient to replace them with Christian feasts bearing exterior analogies to the first? It was evidently easier in this way to abolish idolatrous or corrupt customs.

4th. Let us call attention here to a marvel suggested by what we have said of the teaching of Jesus. This doctrine, this moral teaching, this worship so absolutely perfect, answering so perfectly all the postulates of reason and satisfying so completely all the aspirations of the human heart—in a word, this teaching which nothing presaged or foretold,—how, *without divine intervention*, could it suddenly have fallen from the lips of an obscure artisan of Galilee, who had lived by the labor of his hands, knowing nothing of the disputes of the schools and sects into which Judea was divided? How was this man capable of the arduous study necessary to master the eclecticism alleged to be the origin of Christianity? He was a workman and the reputed son of a workman; all his youth had been spent in Judea, in the midst of his own people, and he died at a comparatively immature age. When, then, could he have travelled throughout the entire East to study its diverse and contrary doctrines? How could he have read the books of India, Persia, and China, of which no translation existed in his own tongue? And how could he have made a choice so absolutely perfect among so many conflicting doctrines replete with errors? Nor had he, it is certain, any knowledge of contemporaneous

philosophy. We have the testimony of Renan in this respect. "Jesus Christ," he says, "had no knowledge of Greek culture, either directly or indirectly, . . . nor was He any more conversant with the extravagant scholasticism which was taught at Jerusalem."

Conclusion.—We have said sufficient to show the inanity of this objection, alleged to be overwhelming, against the true religion. If Christianity has necessarily certain points of resemblance to other religions, it differs from each of them in a multitude of wholly essential points. No doubt it contains all that is good and holy to be found elsewhere, but without any admixture of error or imperfection. It alone, moreover, presents among the various elements of which it is composed a perfect harmony; it alone satisfies everywhere the religious instincts of the human heart; it alone remains perpetually young and promises to endure to the end of mankind. The exterior resemblances which exist between the divine religion and works of human origin do not destroy, then, the *originality* of the divine work; they only prove how perfectly this work is adapted to all the needs of the human soul. In short, while the false religions present *no certain character* of a divine word addressed to mankind, and while they contain maxims and precepts contrary to truth and probity, Christianity alone offers us, together with the purest and most elevating moral teaching, the most evident proofs of a truly *divine* work.[1]

Second Objection, Drawn from a Comparison of Christianity and Buddhism.—Certain rationalists of the present day have thought to depreciate Christianity and rob it of its dogmatic and moral pre-eminence by contrasting it especially with Buddhism.

We are loath to treat of a form of religion so unworthy the attention of a serious mind; but the present circumstances oblige us to say a word sufficient to warn those who might be deceived by a false appearance of learning

[1] Lacordaire, Conf. 2, on God and Man.

and statements as audacious as they are devoid of truth.[1]

[1] In order to prove that Christianity is only a copy of the doctrines of ancient India, Jacolliot, an ex-magistrate of French India, has written several books, the principal of which bear the titles *La Bible dans l'Inde* and *La vie de Jezeus-Christna.* If we mention these works, it is certainly not because of their scientific value, for they have none, but because the inconceivable audacity of the author's lying statements is calculated to impose on the good faith of many readers. When you read the crushing refutation of Mgr. Harlez you can understand what must have been the feeling of this learned Orientalist when he confronted Jacolliot's quotations with the original texts. "A most painful task," he says, "is that of the critic obliged to review a book where ignorance and bad faith meet him at every step: he has to force himself to read to the end; there are moments when the pen falls from his hand. . . . This book, written by a man with no knowledge of science, is a mere tissue of lying statements, anti-scientific hypotheses, and errors unpardonable in a student of the lowest class. It is permeated with a dishonest spirit and inconceivable disingenousness. Jacolliot indulges chiefly in two styles of argument: one is to substitute for history the most improbable hypotheses, the other is to affirm, with the most imperturbable assurance, falsifications, contradictions the most evident, the most inexcusable, the most unworthy of a man with any self-respect; he even goes so far as to invent, completely, long texts, attributing them to authors who never wrote a line." See proofs of this appreciation in Mgr. Harlez' *La Bible dans l'Inde.* This judgment, given by a learned Catholic, is confirmed by other equally competent scholars unbiassed by any religious ideas. Let us cite, for example, Julien Vinson, an author who belongs to the militant materialist school, and well known by his labors in the Indian tongues called Dravidian. "I could have mentioned," he says, "in the preceding enumeration publications bearing the name of Jacolliot, an ex-magistrate of French India, but I am speaking only of serious, genuine, or at least *conscientious* works" (*Revue de linguistique, t. XIII,* 15 *Janvier* 1880, pp. 56 and 57). The celebrated Indianist, Angelo de Gubernatis, of the mythic school of Strauss, does not deign to accord him any more notice than the following: "Such is the case, Signor Jacolliot, credulous dreamer to the contrary notwithstanding". (Ch. II., p. 265).

The manner in which writers have branded Mr. Jacolliot makes us readily divine that his Jezeus-Christna is a creation of the author's inventive genius. Never in ancient India did there exist either a

Let us hasten to say that all rationalists are by no means so deplorably blind. There are those, on the contrary, who publicly proclaim Christianity to be superior to Buddhism. To quote a few significant witnesses: Kuenen declares that Christianity is as superior to Buddhism as life is to death, as heaven with its beatific vision is to Nirvana, as a living body is to a phantom. Reveille, in his lecture at the College of France, expressed himself in almost the same terms. J. J. Ampère, after enumerating the greater number of analogies upon which certain writers insist, does not hesitate to state publicly that "between the two religions, that of Christ and that of Buddha, there is a profound and radical difference: the difference between theism and pantheism." Ad. Franck, in his studies of the laws of Oriental nations, cannot help showing that the virtues taught by Buddhism are sterile for want of a solid basis, of a true understanding of man's relations with nature and with God.

Again, Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, who studied Buddhism for thirty years. "Reared in the bosom of an admirable philosophy and religion, we take little pains," he says, "to learn their value and the immense services they render us. We enjoy them, while we are completely indifferent and even ungrateful to them. The marvels of civilization multiply about us. We profit by them, but we rarely ask to what our races owe their great welfare, their stability, their comparative enlightenment, while at our door are other races

Jezeus or a Christna, still less a Jezeus-Christna; the very name is impossible in Sanscrit. But it had to be proved that it was the Vedas, the sacred books of India, which gave the idea of the Christ of the Gospel. We find, it is true, but in books posterior to the Vedas, a certain Krishna (a word which signifies black), who bears no resemblance to our divine Saviour. It is only in the Puranas, books written in the middle of the Middle Ages, that they inserted in the legend of this personage traits bearing a certain analogy to facts of the Gospel. We know that Christianity was brought at an early age to India, and that the Christian colonies continued in existence there until the arrival of the Portuguese. See *La Bible dans l'Inde*, by Mgr. de Harlez.

who are still in a semi-barbarous state and who have never, since the beginning of time, been able to form either societies or governments that would be bearable to us. I think that the study of Buddhism, even in its most general characteristics, will help us to solve this enigma. We shall see why a religion which to-day counts more adherents than any other, has done so little for the happiness of mankind, and we shall find the explanation of its impotence in the strange and deplorable doctrines which it has professed." Farther on he adds: "Despite appearances, sometimes very specious, Buddhism is simply one long series of contradictions; it is not calumniating it to say that it is a spirituality without a soul, virtue without duty, morality without freedom, a world without God. What can we derive from such teachings? What things one must forget to become the blind disciples of Buddhism! How low one must descend in the scale of nations and of civilizations! The only but immense service which Buddhism can render us is to make us, by means of the sad contrast it offers, better appreciate the inestimable value of our beliefs by showing us what it has cost a portion of mankind to be without them."

This testimony from writers not of the faith may suffice for the irrevocable condemnation of Buddhism. Present circumstances, however, constrain us to offer a few reflections on the dogmatic and moral teaching of Buddhism. We shall speak first of primitive, theoretical Buddhism, then of Buddhism as it is popularly known and practised.

Historical Details. — The founder of Buddhism was Sakya-Muni (the sage, the ascetic of Sakya), better known under the name of Buddha.[1] We know his life only through biographies which appeared several centuries after his existence. The Buddhists themselves do not agree as to the

[1] Buddha is only a qualifying term meaning one who has attained to true knowledge and moral perfection by his own efforts. Sakya-Muni is the Buddha illumined by excellence, a mere man, but infinitely superior to ordinary men.

period in which he lived. Max Müller gives the date of his death as 477 before Christ; other Indianists vary between 343 and 370.[1]

As to the legends, of no historic value whatever, which embellish the history of Buddha, they were probably created, part of them at least, five or six centuries after his death, a period when the Gospel had already spread into India. This would readily explain certain traits in the legend which bear a strange resemblance to facts related in the Gospel. The legend itself, however, is by no means the same in all the Buddhist schools.[2]

The doctrine of the founder of Buddhism was written, not by him, but by his disciples, and the canon of the books which contain it was drawn up only 88 years before Christ. Buddhism, which is nothing more than a sort of rebellion of the individual reason against the old Brahmin despotism, and notably against the anti-fraternal and anti-social dogma of caste, spread over the vast plateaux of upper Asia and invaded China and Japan. It prevails also in Thibet, Burmah, Siam, Ceylon, etc.

Let it not be supposed, moreover, that Buddhism is everywhere one and the same. It is true, it is customary to

[1] What would unbelievers say if there were similar uncertainty in regard to the authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures and the hero of the Gospel? According to Senart, all that can be stated with certainty in regard to Buddha is reduced to two points: 1st. Buddhism had a founder; 2d. This founder was an anchorite, an ascetic, whom the teaching of Brahminism could not satisfy. "Have we not met with Orientalists who maintain that Sakya-Muni, the Buddha, was probably only a solar myth? And if they were to succeed some day in proving this contention, what would become of the resemblance which they have so often sought to establish between Jesus and Buddha?" Picard. 266.

[2] P. Bonniot, in his *Le Miracle et ses contrefaçons*, gives a few of the marvels attributed to Buddha: it would be difficult to conceive of anything more absurd, more incoherent, and more grotesque. A biography of Buddha is to be found in Mgr. Harlez' *Manuel du Boud-*

estimate the disciples of Buddha as 350,000,000. There are those, Rhys-David for example, who say 500,000,000; but these are not all real Buddhists by any means. This number includes more than 400,000,000 Chinese. Now, though the Chinese include Buddha at times among the objects of their worship, they care little for his doctrine, and in no wise do they call themselves Buddhists.

It is an undisputed fact, moreover, that Buddhism is divided into two principal branches which have taken directly opposite characters. The Buddhism of the North has been moulded, more or less, by the ideas of the people among whom it was introduced—in fact it has become idolatry. In China it consists in ranking Buddha and the personages of the Buddhist Olympus among the spirits from whom favors are petitioned and in making gifts to the bonzes. In reality it is no longer Buddhism. On the other hand, the South (Ceylon and the East Indies) has remained generally faithful to the system of the founder: the disciples still seek to attain Nirvana by the practice of renunciation and penance, and the Buddhist monasteries offer examples of genuine virtue, admirable discipline, and profound faith in their doctrines.

dhism, d'après le catéchisme du Subhâdra bhikshou et la Vajratcchedika. This catechism is the work of a monk and doctor of Buddhism who wished to give his coreligionists and Europeans an exact and perfect knowledge of the doctrine they were invited to practise and propagate. The learned professor of Louvain has merely translated it.

The zealous Buddhist is careful to pass over in silence certain traits not altogether creditable to his hero. He does not mention, for example, that he died of a fit of indigestion with which gluttony had something to do. He is equally reticent in regard to a multitude of marvellous events which make Buddha out to be the most supernatural being that ever existed. The reason of this reticence is that Buddhism absolutely rejects miracles: everything is done according to the universal laws of nature which bind all beings, whatever their perfection or their elevation. Here again we are confronted with one of the contradictions with which this strange religion abounds.

1. Theoretical Buddhism.—Sakya-Muni's end or object was exclusively moral: he cared little for the solution of questions relating to the origin of man, to the nature of God and of other beings; he gave his attention almost entirely to moral precepts. His sole end was to procure for himself and for others deliverance from temporal evils, and above all to escape the necessity of being born again, for all life, he believed, was fatally miserable. We see at once that Buddhism does not merit the name of religion, and that it responds in no way to the postulates of reason and of the human heart. Moreover, its dogmatic character, upon which morality is necessarily based, abounds in errors and contradictions. We need only point out a few of these and we have a superabundant refutation of the whole system.

A. Dogmatic Character.[1]—The doctrine of Buddha includes:

[1] For a fuller knowledge of the metaphysical speculations which form the basis of Buddhist morality see the work of Mgr. Harlez already quoted. This dogmatic teaching is borrowed from Vajratcchedika (The Cleaver of the Diamond), the most famous of all the books, written by one of the most fervent and best instructed adepts of Buddhism. In reading this faithful summary of the doctrine of Buddha one asks one's self whether the author of such a doctrine was in his right mind or whether he spoke seriously. Here are a few of the chief features of these fundamental lessons. The rest are exactly like these specimens.

1. There is no law nor doctrine revealed by Buddha, for the reason that this doctrine is incomprehensible, has no exterior sign to distinguish it; it is neither doctrine nor non-doctrine.

2. If a virtuous man or woman were to fill the world with seven precious jewels and gave them to illuminated Buddhas, their merits would be immense, incommensurable. And why? Because this mass of merits has been declared a non-mass by Buddha, and that is why Buddha has said it is a mass, a true mass of merits.

3. If there were found a man as large as Himalaya, his individuality would no doubt be very great. And why? Because what is called individuality is declared by Buddha a non-individuality, and that is why it is called individuality. It is a man with an extraordinarily

1st. *Pantheism,* or rather *Positivism* and *Atheism.* In reality Buddhism does not formally deny or affirm the existence of a supreme being. On this capital point Buddha and his disciples, at least, refrain from pronouncing judgment. Therefore the system is justly called atheistic. Yet, strange as it may seem, prayer and adoration are prescribed. An attentive study of peoples reputed to be Buddhists shows that they have divinities to whom they offer adoration: in one place it is the serpent or the dragon, in another and almost everywhere it is the devil; in the kingdoms of the extreme East the worship of the spirits of ancestors seems to predominate; elsewhere, again, it is Sakya-Muni who has become the god of his disciples. Moreover, this diversity was inevitable: when the Buddhist teachers systematically refused to pronounce upon the existence and the nature of God they left their adherents free to form whatever idea they would of Him, and to choose their god or gods according as it suited them.[1]

large body. For he is declared by Buddha to have no body, and that is why it can be said that he has a large body.

4. The dust of the whole world is no doubt an immense mass. And why? Because this dust has been declared non-dust by Buddha, and that is why it is called dust. And this world has been declared a non-world; that is why it is called a world.

5. It is said that Buddha should be recognized by exterior marks. Not at all. For these marks have been declared non-marks by Buddha, and for this reason they are called marks.

6. There is no doctrine which may have been learned by Buddha in a perfect illumination. All doctrine taught by Buddha is neither truth nor error. Because all doctrines are non-doctrines, declared such by Buddha. That is why it is said: All these doctrines are the doctrines of Buddha.

7. In the last age there will be beings who will believe in these doctrines, and these beings will not be beings or non-beings. For these beings have been declared non-beings by Buddha, and that is why they are called beings.

[1] For the Buddhist there is no personal God, no creation. As to the manner in which the world was produced Buddha gives no opinion, for the reason that he judged that this knowledge was of no value for

2d. *Metempsychosis*, or the rebirth of souls in other bodies. A fatal law, inherent in things, connects suffering with wrong-doing, and happiness with good deeds. Men live to expiate their evil deeds: those who have led a good life are born again to a new life in happier conditions, and go thus from transmigration to transmigration until they reach the final term, Nirvana.

3d. What is *Nirvana?* There is nothing more obscure in the doctrine of Buddhism. The most probable opinion is that which makes Nirvana the *absolute suppression of existence.* Various Buddhist books give the following definition: "Nirvana cannot be a place of sensible felicity, or intellectual happiness, or incorporeality, or consciousness, or unconsciousness of self." What then can it be, if not the negation of existence—nothingness? Moreover, the comparisons employed to explain it certainly convey an analogous idea; for example, it is said to be the absorption of the creature in the Great Being, the universal Being—an unconscious and motionless mass; again, it is a state of passive and negative repose, void of all thought and all sentiment; in a word, it is at least the equivalent of annihilation.

4th. The principle upon which Buddhism bases this metempsychosis and this strange beatitude is pessimism. To the Buddhist, life is an evil, and true happiness consists in being delivered from it; by the practice of virtue he escapes after death the law which would oblige him to be born again to expiate his faults. He who is without stain will be born no more.

Appreciation.—All that can be said of atheism, positivism, metempsychosis, nihilism, applies equally to Buddhist dogma.

the end he had in view, i.e., deliverance from the evils of life, or rather from life itself—for the complete annihilation of personality. "The religions of the far East, Buddhism, Brahminism, Confucianism and the rest, have no conception of God as a Creator. Metaphysical scepticism is their bond of unity. They aspire to found a moral law of love and charity precisely on the invincible ignorance of man as to his origin and destiny." Picard, p. 230.

Is this a doctrine fitted to elevate or benefit souls? Is it not rather a metaphysical theory fashioned by dreamers and for dreamers? Annihilation! what an incentive to the practice of virtue, what a reward for a good life! Yet let us not forget, Buddhism aims to be practical; it is a moral end which it pursues.

B. Moral Character.—Strange and full of error is the dogma upon which the moral teaching of Buddhism is based. Yet this teaching in itself is elevating and pure in every respect: it prescribes renunciation and repression of the passions. At the same time the renunciation is carried to excess: not only must all irregular affection be eradicated from the heart, but every desire, every affection. The duty of the Buddhist monks—and they are the real Buddhists; laymen are incapable of attaining Nirvana—is to attain a complete inertia, a perfect state of moral quietude. These Cramanas (ascetics) or Bhikshus (beggars), besides the obligation of fasts, prayers, corrections, the confession of their faults, are compelled to live upon alms, to practise celibacy, and to bury themselves in profound meditation on the nothingness to which they aspire: this constitutes their sole occupation. Those who are not monks are commanded above all to love men and to desire to lead them to Nirvana, that is, to deliverance from the inevitable evils of existence.

Appreciation.—1st. The morality of Buddhism cannot, as we have already said, be called moral teaching, since it is without foundation; it does not emanate from God, hence it suggests no lawgiver, no judge, no pardon, and it is deprived of effectual sanction, for annihilation is no real reward, and existence is not in itself a punishment fitted to deter the evil-doer. Moreover, a law which *exists of itself* and which *fatally* produces its own sanction is something most irrational and hopeless. For the Buddhist, life, in whatever form it presents itself, is one long chain of miseries—a real evil of which he must rid himself as soon as possible. And to accomplish this end he must pass through an existence not

only deprived of every enjoyment and earthly pleasure, but filled with continual renunciation, mortification, and penance. After being thus tormented during one or several existences, what may the Buddhist hope for? The destruction of his individuality, his annihilation, or at most his re-entrance as an atom into the unconscious mass of the universe!

2d. Though at first sight the moral teaching of Buddhism presents much that seems elevating, yet in reality it is a sort of stoic perfection—an inertia of indifference productive of egotism and pride. The charity of Buddhism is in contradiction to one of its chief precepts which proscribes all affection, all desire even for life itself. We need hardly call attention to the abyss between this charity and the charity inculcated by Christianity. This is evident even to unbelievers. "We must recognize," says the rationalist Oldenberg, "an intrinsic difference between these two principles of morality, the sentiment of Buddhist benevolence and Christian charity. . . . The love of benevolence manifest in Buddhist morality—a sentiment half negative and half positive—may be said to approach Christian charity, but does not come up to it; just as the beatitude of Nirvana, though radically different from the Christian's conception of beatitude, presents, nevertheless, an uncertain and vacillating image of it. The Buddhist is commanded, not so much to love his neighbor, as to refrain from hating him; he is taught to excite and foster a spirit of kindness toward all creatures, but this spirit is not the effect of love, but rather the result of the deliberate opinion and persuasion that everything will be better in the world under the influence of the law of benevolence, and that he who practises this virtue will find a reward in the law of nature."

Remark.—We who enjoy the benefit of Catholic teaching are in no way astonished at the relative moral perfection found in primitive or theoretic Buddhism, a human and philosophic work. We know that after the fall man preserved his intellectual and moral powers: if they were

weakened, they were by no means destroyed. To practise supernatural virtues we need the help of divine grace; but this grace is not necessary to lead, within certain limits, a good life in conformity with the natural law.

2. Practical and Popular Buddhism.—What we have said so far applies only to primitive and theoretic Buddhism, to that found in books. Buddhism is quite different in its popular and practical reality. Here we find profound differences between it and Christianity. By one of those contradictions unaccounted for by scholars, but which is an incontestable fact, Buddhism, while posing before the *élite* of the so-called sages with the prestige of free thought, posed at the same time before the people with the attraction of religious formalism, multiplied idolatrous rites and observances, and became at an early stage a sort of *polytheism* and *superstitious magic*. "The instincts of the human heart," M. de Broglie justly observes, "were stronger than theory: the ideas of God and of a future life reappeared, but under the form of superstition, in a religion of which the proper doctrine is atheism and nihilism."

A Word in Regard to the Propagation of Buddhism.—It is easy to explain the astonishing success of a religious system which overthrew Brahminism and threatened even to replace it completely. The rapid propagation of Buddhism is due to various causes; among others, the religious and social protest against the secular tyranny of the old Brahminism, the proclamation of fraternity, and the abolition of castes, which powerfully attracted the people. Contrary to the Brahmins, who reserved to themselves the privilege of studying and teaching the science of religion and the means of attaining final beatitude, Buddha and his disciples preached publicly to all the world; they declared all men equal before the *universal Law*, and called women as well as men to the religious life: the impure Dasyu as well as the Brahmin, the criminal as well as the just man, the widow, the forsaken wife,—all were free to seek an honorable and

peaceful refuge in the monastic state. Moreover, the poverty taught by Buddhism, and its wholly natural morality, so tolerant for laymen, could not excite against it the passions of individuals and peoples. Far from proscribing superstition, it encouraged and increased every kind. Besides, it had long enjoyed the protection of rulers; it was only after having reigned in India more than a thousand years, in competition with Brahminism, that it spread to the neighboring countries.[1]

Conclusion.—Let us conclude this sketch of Buddhism with the appreciation of it given by the learned Orientalist, Mgr. Harlez: "There is little foundation for the comparison which writers seek to establish between Christianity and Buddhism. Buddhism possesses a few rather elevating moral precepts, and that is all that can be said for it. Its metaphysics (or dogmas) are absurd, and differ in no way from materialism. It is the same in regard to its anthropologic and cosmogonic conceptions. Its moral teaching is based upon the irrational idea of metempsychosis, and the only prospect offered disciples is a life spent in privations and penance, to end in what? Nothingness, or what comes to the same thing—the destruction of personality. Men of letters among modern Buddhists deny the charge of atheism: they claim to honor God and to contemplate Him as the *universal Law*. But this is a mere evasion. This law is a pure abstraction and can never be a personal and active being. Compare the *Our Father* with the canonical books of Buddhism and we shall see at a glance the infinite distance which separates them."

[1] See Aiken; Schanz, II., ch. 2; Lilly, Claims, ch. 2; Anc. Rel. ch. 3; A. C. Q. xiii.; Harlez in C. S. S. L. i. I. E. R. Dec. 1901; Dering, E. H., Esoteric Buddhism; C. W. Aug. Sept., '95; Picard, p. 233.

X. Tenth Proof.

THE INCOMPARABLE HOLINESS OF CHRIST.[1]

We have seen the eminent holiness of the dogmatic and moral teaching of Jesus. His whole life was no less admirable: it was this doctrine put in practice; He never imposed a precept which He had not fulfilled to the letter; He never preached a virtue of which He had not given in Himself the most perfect example. Contrary to the general practice of legislators, and particularly of impostors, He taught first by example and then by precept (Acts i. 1). Thus in teaching us our duties toward God, toward man, toward ourselves, He could truly say: "I have given you an example, that as I have done, so do you also" (John xiii. 15).

1st. We have only to read the Gospel to be convinced that all virtues were united in Jesus in such a divine degree and in so just a measure as to make Him the type, the ideal of all perfection. From His infancy and during His whole life the sole end of all His words, of all His actions was to glorify God by causing Him to be known, loved, and served, and by saving mankind; He Himself declares that He cares not for His own glory, that He does only what is pleasing to the Father. During His whole life He was meek and gentle, grave and laborious, submissive and patient.

In all men, even the most perfect, natural infirmity reveals itself in something; the ideal perfection found in biographies is a mixture of fiction and history; but in Jesus, and in Him only, we find absolute perfection and pure historic truth. This unfathomable perfection never faltered in the various events of His earthly career, in the intimate familiarity of friendship, in the midst of the multitude when harassed by its rudeness and importunity, in the joyous festivity of the marriage-feast of Cana, in the agony of Gethsemane, in the

[1] See Lives of Christ by Didon, Fouard, Maas, Veuillot, Elliott, and Costello.

ignominy of His Passion, in the anguish of Calvary, where He expired in inexpressible suffering, abandoned by His own, insulted by His triumphant enemies, and apparently abandoned by His Father. "Never will it be possible to rise above Christ," says Strauss, "or to conceive of a being equal to Him." "Jesus Christ," says Renan, "will never be surpassed."

2d. His virtue was so *pure*, so incontestable, that He could defy His bitterest enemies, who watched His actions and examined His words in order to ensnare Him. He could defy them to convince Him of sin: "Which of you shall convince Me of sin?" And during His Passion, notwithstanding the witnesses bribed to testify against Him, the pagan judge was forced to proclaim His innocence no less than five times. Moreover, modern impiety itself, after seeking in all His words and in all His life to find matter of condemnation, is obliged to bow before Him and render homage to His virtues. If it refuses to bow the knee before His *divinity*, it readily acknowledges Him as the wisest of men. J. J. Rousseau goes so far as to confess that "if the life and death of Socrates are those of a sage, the life and death of Christ are those of a God."

3d. Yet among all the virtues so brilliantly manifested in Jesus there is none which shines with greater lustre, which so powerfully won the hearts of His followers, as His enchanting goodness. It would be necessary to quote here the whole Gospel, for there is not a page of it which does not record the most touching proofs of this virtue.

"Jesus," says Lacordaire, "carried the power of loving even to tenderness, and to a kind of tenderness so new that it was needful to create a name for it, and that it should form a distinct species in the analysis of human feelings—I mean the evangelic unction. Jesus Christ was tender toward all men; it was He who said: 'Whatsoever you shall do to the least of these My brethren, you will have done it unto Me' (Matth. xxv. 40), an expression which introduced Christian

fraternity into the world, and which still daily engenders love. He was tender toward sinners; He sat at meat with them, and when doctrinal pride reproached Him for it, He replied: 'I am not come for those that are in health, but for those that are sick' (Matth. ix. 12). Perceiving a publican who climbed up into a tree to see Him pass by, He says to him, 'Zaccheus, make haste and come down, for this day I must abide in thy house' (Luke xix. 5). A sinful woman approaches Him and even ventures to anoint His feet with ointment, to the great scandal of a large assembly; He reassures her by that immortal allocution: 'Many sins are forgiven her because she has loved much' (Luke vii. 47). They bring before Him a woman taken in adultery, in order to force a judgment from Him which by its very leniency may compromise Him; He answers: 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her' (John viii. 7). He was tender toward His ungrateful and parricidal country; and, beholding its walls from afar, He wept, saying: 'Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldst not!' (Matth. xxiii. 37). He was so tender toward His friends as to wash their feet, and to permit a very young man to lean upon His breast on one of the most solemn occasions of His life. Even at His crucifixion He was tender toward His executioners, and, lifting up His soul to His Father for them, He said: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Luke xxiii. 34). No earthly life shows such a blending of light and love."

We must confine ourselves here to a general glance at the life of Him who offered Himself as model to all men without exception, and who uttered these equally astonishing and true words: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; He that followeth Me walketh not in darkness."[1]

[1] Lacordaire, conf. 1 on Jesus Christ.

REMARKS.—1st. The character of Jesus, despite its incomparable perfection, is natural and true; it offers nothing false, nothing affected, nothing constrained. If the divine nature is shown by the absence of the least imperfection, humanity is equally evident in the truth of its natural emotions. As Jesus desired to teach all men, His brethren, the way to heaven, first by *example* and then by precept, He deigned to experience all the legitimate sentiments of our nature and to pass through all our trials. "We have not," says St. Paul, "a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities, but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin." Like us Jesus labored, prayed, wept, and suffered. Like us He loved His Mother, His disciples, His friends, His country, the unfortunate, the abandoned; like us He experienced sadness, compassion, trouble, fear, weariness; like us, and more keenly than we, He felt physical and moral suffering. From the manger to the cross, in every action, in every sentiment, He could offer Himself as a model to be imitated.

2d. The perfection of the character and of the life of Jesus was the more striking because of the contrast it offered to all that was about Him. With the exception of His blessed Mother, and a few chosen souls inspired by Him, Jesus met on every hand a vile and carnal people, hypocritical Scribes, proud Pharisees, and pure formalists, disciples full of themselves and of gross faults. What a contrast between the weakness, the vice, the violence by which He was surrounded, and His holiness, His delicacy, His meekness, His patience! "Where among His own people did Jesus," says Rousseau, "acquire that elevating and pure morality which He alone has taught by example and by precept? From the bosom of the most violent fanaticism issues the highest wisdom, and the simplicity of the most heroic virtues honors the vilest of people."

3d. The holiness of Jesus alone is a creative holiness: despite the incomparable superiority of its teachings, none are more easily followed; hence it has begotten in all ages in-

numerable disciples. "No sage," says Voltaire, "ever had the slightest influence on the morality of even his immediate surroundings, but Christ has influenced the whole world." The example of Jesus, no less than His teaching, has unceasingly produced everywhere, during nineteen centuries, miracles of obedience, of purity, of humility, of zeal, of devotion, and of holiness. True. the saints also have had their sanctifying influence, but it was only by reproducing in themselves traits of the perfection they contemplated in Jesus.

4th. Still another thing which sets forth the marvellousness of the teaching and the example of Jesus is that He is imitated in that which is most *repugnant to nature:* He is a thorn-crowned Leader, and His disciples must follow Him in His life of humility, obedience, abnegation, and sacrifice. Whether we study Him in the manger, in His hidden, in His public life; whether we contemplate Him in His Passion and His death, we shall find Him giving us everywhere the example of virtues most opposed to our evil inclinations. And this example is followed: "They that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences" (Gal. v. 24). Christians, in order to advance in perfection, seek only to triumph over themselves in imitation of Him whom St. Paul calls "the image of the invisible God" (Coloss. i. 15).

5th. If Jesus succeeded by His word, and still more by His example, in reforming the world, it was because He made Himself loved. This very love is a marvel in itself. Great men succeed in winning admiration, in exciting enthusiasm; but who among the rarest geniuses has ever won and retained the love of posterity during long ages? "One man alone," says Lacordaire, "has won from all ages the tribute of undying love; He alone has been loved with a strong and tender, a deep and efficacious love by countless souls, and at the present day millions are ready to die for Him." Read in the 3d conf. on Jesus Christ the eloquent page in which this same orator speaks of the love which Jesus Christ excites in souls.

It is impossible to find a saint who has not loved Jesus with fervent ardor. "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee," St. Peter answers with sad tenderness. St. Paul declares that nothing can separate him from the love of this Jesus, whose adorable name he repeats in his epistles no less than two hundred and forty-three times. St. Augustine cannot find words to express the sweetness contained in this divine name. St. Bernard declares that everything is insipid to him without the name of Jesus; he says it is as honey to the taste, music to the ear, joy to the heart. And all the heroes of Christianity have spoken in like manner.

It is this love which still impels so many souls to imitate Jesus when they have learned His divine charms and ineffable goodness; and their imitation of Him is perfect in proportion to the purity and fervor of their love. What is a Christian worthy of the name but a man who bears in his soul, in his body, in his whole being, the deep imprint of Jesus, a man who strives to make his thoughts, his desires, his words, and his actions conformable to those of his divine Exemplar? A saint is only a grand Christian imitating Jesus in a more complete, more perfect, more heroic manner.

Conclusion.—The mind absolutely refuses to believe that Jesus, this type of the highest perfection, desired to teach us anything but truth. Reason will never admit that a man could unite the most revolting hypocrisy with the purest and most sublime doctrine, with the most admirable, the most perfect, the holiest life recorded in the annals of mankind.[1]

An impostor, moreover, never would have employed means tending to defeat his enterprise; far from flattering the passions and caprices of His fellow beings, He did not

[1] Infidels, in order to explain the rôle of Jesus, are obliged to have recourse to one of two hypotheses, that He was either a fool or an impostor. Renan, however, manages to make Him an impostor deceiving in good faith, that is, a hypocrite and fool combined: an explanation more inconceivable than the others, for it only adds an odious to an absurd hypothesis.

ignore their faults, He did not seek the protection of the great or powerful of this world, He did not seek worldly possessions. On the contrary, He waged war against vice, He preached the forgiveness of injuries, the practice of humility, abnegation, and self-denial; His chosen associates were among the poor and the disinherited; He carried His disinterestedness so far as to be without even a stone upon which to rest His head. Far from avoiding the suffering and death prepared for Him by His enemies, whose designs He knew and foretold, He went to meet the soldiers charged to seize Him, and delivered Himself into their hands. And in the midst of the most terrible outrages and the most cruel torments, His calmness and gentleness never faltered for a moment; His last act was an act of mercy, and His last word a prayer for His enemies. Is this the death, is this the life of an impostor? Yet Jesus must be an impostor if He was not sent from heaven, for He publicly proclaimed that He was sent by God. To the Samaritan woman, for example, who was expecting the Messias, He solemnly said: This Messias whom you await, "I am He who am speaking with thee." Would God permit the most sacrilegious imposture to be confirmed by a life so holy that human reason is forced to accept its testimony? It is absolutely impossible. Therefore the mission of Jesus is divine, and divine also is the religion He came to establish.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The divinity of Christ's mission means the divinity of His work. This is the question of which we have been treating in the preceding pages. The divinity of His person is a question apart. Moses also was sent by God; he was also charged to establish among the Jews a new religion superior to the one which preceded it; yet it never entered into the minds of his followers to adore him as God. Jesus, on the contrary, has been adored as God for nineteen centuries by followers who glory in bearing His name and in following His doctrine. This fact is indisputable; but is Jesus entitled to this adoration, is He really God? [1]

This is the important question which now presents itself. It belongs, it is true, to a course of Special Dogmatics, and not to Apologetics, yet we do not feel that we can pass it over in complete silence. As we have been occupied up to the present with Our Lord, as we have stated the prophecies which announced Him and those which He Himself uttered; as we have spoken of His life, His miracles, His Resurrection, of His influence on mankind, etc., we feel it incumbent to say a few words of that which crowns and explains all—His divinity; particularly, as this central and fundamental truth of our holy religion admits of the most brilliant and striking verification. Relying on the incontestable proofs which we have just stated, we believe in the divinity of the mission of

[1] Bougaud; Didon, Belief, etc.; Freppel; Gratry; Hedley; Maas (Ch. in Type, etc.); Hunter, II., tr. 11; Morris, The Son of Man; Schanz, II., ch. 16 ff.; A. C. Q. i. 100, 475; M. S. H., Dec. 1901.

Jesus, because He announced Himself as sent by God; on the authority of the same proofs we must believe in the divinity of His person, if He positively proclaimed Himself God.

Now if there is one thing that has been incontestably proved by innumerable and clear texts, it is that Jesus affirmed that He is God. He declared on numerous occasions, in the most absolute and unequivocal manner, that He is God, the Son of God, equal in all things to His Father who sent Him. Let us prove this briefly.[1]

1. A very simple but peremptory argument is that every unprejudiced mind is completely convinced, by the mere reading of the Gospel, that Jesus proclaimed Himself God, equal in all things to the Father. This conviction is not merely the effect of this or that text taken out of the context, but of the whole book. The special object of St. John's gospel, as ecclesiastical writers, St. Jerome, Tertullian, and others, affirm, is to establish the divinity of Christ; and this is just the charge rationalists make against him. This is sufficiently evident in the beginning and the conclusion of the work. Here is the beginning:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him: and without Him was made nothing that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." The end is no less explicit: "These things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, Son of God." Now when a Christian is convinced that such is the inevitable result of reading a book which he

[1] We must content ourselves here with the decisive proof furnished by the words of Christ Himself. See Lacordaire, conf. 1 on Jesus Christ. Dogmatic theology gives other equally conclusive proofs, drawn from the prophecies announcing that the Messias would be God: Isaias xxxv., xxv., ix., xl.; Bar. iii.; Ps. xliv., cix., etc.; or from the teaching of the apostles: Acts iii.; Rom. ix.; Phil. ii.· Coloss. i., ii.; Heb i., etc.; or from apostolic traditions, or from ecclesiastical history, etc

justly regards as inspired by the Holy Spirit, it becomes equally clear to him that this result was intended by God.

Infidels themselves, if in good faith, must admit this conclusion, since they all, with few exceptions, admire Jesus as the wisest of men, the most beautiful character that the world has ever seen, the ideal of perfection.

2. Let us now review the gospels, and select among many texts sufficient to make it evident that they establish the divinity of Jesus.

1st. Jesus attributes to Himself that which men have always, with reason, considered as *belonging to God alone.* "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life" (John xiv. 6). "I am the Light of the world: he that followeth Me, walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life" (ib. viii. 12). "I am the living bread, which came down from heaven" (ib. vi. 51). "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day" (ib. vi. 55). "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me although he be dead, shall live" (ib. xi. 25). "The Son of man shall send His angels, and they shall gather together His elect" (Mark xiii. 27). "The Son of man shall send His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all scandals, and them that work iniquity" (Matth. xiii. 41). "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will" (John v. 21). "For where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matth. xviii. 20). "Whatsoever you ask the Father in My name He will give it to you. Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, that will I do" (John xv. 16; xiv. 13). "And every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for My name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall possess life everlasting" (Matth. xix. 29). "For what things soever the Father doth, these the Son also doth in like manner" (John v. 19). "If any one love Me, he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We

will come to him, and will make our abode with him" (ib. xiv. 23). "All things whatsoever the Father hath are Mine" (ib. xvi. 15).

Our Saviour attests His divinity no less clearly when He forgives sin (Luke v. 21–24); when He declares that He will send the Holy Spirit, as the Father hath sent Him (John xiv. 26; xv. 26); when He announces that He will come at the end of the world, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to each one according to his works (Matth. xxv. 31–46).

If we would appreciate the conclusive evidence of these texts, let us suppose for a moment that they are uttered by a simple mortal!

Jesus proclaims Himself eternal: "Before Abraham was made I am" (John viii. 58). Observe the analogy between this expression and that which David uses in speaking of God: "Before the mountains were made, . . . Thou art God" (Ps. lxxxix. 2). It recalls also the sublime definition which God gives of Himself, "I am who am." "And now glorify Thou Me, O Father, with Thyself, with the glory which I had, before the world was, with Thee" (John xvii. 5). He shows that He knows all things, even the most secret recesses of the human heart (Matth. ix. 4). He is omnipotent, for it is by His own power that He will return to life (John x. 18). The miracles which He works and which suppose a divine power are performed in His own name and by His own merits. Other thaumaturges work miracles in the name of God, in virtue of a delegated power; it was as sovereign Master that Jesus commanded nature, men, angels, and demons: "Young man, I say to thee, arise" (Luke vii. 14). "I will, be thou made clean" (Matth. viii. 3). "Lazarus, come forth from the tomb" (John xi. 43), etc. The source of this power is so truly within Him that a miraculous virtue escapes, so to speak, from His divine person, without His knowledge, as we see in the healing of the issue of blood. Moreover, not only does He exercise at will this power

which belongs to Him by right, but He delegates it to whom He pleases; He promises His apostles that they shall work in His name miracles more marvellous than His own.

2d. Jesus clearly affirms His identity with the nature of His Father, as well as the distinction of persons, and consequently claims the worship and honors due to God alone. "I and the Father are one" (John x. 30). You believe in God, said He to His apostles, believe also in Me (ib. xiv. 1). "God so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son." "He that believeth in Him is not judged; but he that doth not believe in Him is already judged: because he believeth not in the name of the only-begotten Son of God" (ib. iii. 16, 18). He wishes us to pray to Him even as we would to the Father (ib. xiv. 13; xvi. 23, 24). While He proclaims the divine precept: The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve, He permits Himself to be adored by the man born blind, by the holy women, and by His disciples (ib. ix. 38; Matth. xxviii. 9–17). He declares that all men should honor the Son as they honor the Father (John v. 23). When St. Thomas, finally convinced of the Resurrection of his Master, said to Him, "My Lord and my God," far from censuring these words as blasphemous, Jesus publicly approved the faith of His disciple, and blessed those who in future ages would imitate his example (ib. xx. 28, 29).

3d. Let us mention particularly a few solemn occasions when, in presence of His disciples, of His enemies, or of His very judges, or the great council of His nation, Jesus proclaimed His divinity in the most positive and formal manner. We shall see that even those who pursued Him with implacable hatred never misapprehended the meaning of His words.

He questioned His disciples one day about Himself: "Whom do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God." Far from rejecting this clear and positive profession of faith, Jesus praises His disciple for it, and declares it to be inspired

by His Father in heaven, since He alone could make known the mystery of the eternal generation (Matth. xvi. 13–18).

On another occasion, Jesus being in the midst of the people, they said to Him: "How long dost Thou hold our souls in suspense? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus answered: "I speak to you and you believe not: the works that I do in the name of My Father, they give testimony of Me. . . . I and the Father are one." On hearing these words the Jews took up stones to stone Him as a blasphemer. Jesus, undisturbed by their threats, and far from retracting, said to them: "Many good works I have showed you from My Father; for which of those works do you stone Me?" The Jews answered Him: "For a good work we stone Thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that, being a man, Thou makest Thyself God." (John x.)

Behold Him now before the Sanhedrin, the supreme religious tribunal of His nation. The high priest puts the question formally in the most unequivocal terms: "I adjure Thee by the living God that Thou tell us if Thou be the Christ the Son of God." "Thou hast said it," Jesus calmly replies. And to confirm this categorical affirmation He adds: "Nevertheless, I say to you, hereafter you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven." On hearing these words, the high priest rent his garments, saying: "What further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now you have heard the blasphemy; what think you? But they answering said: He is guilty of death." (Matth. xxvi. 63, 64, 65, 66.)

From this tribunal Jesus is led to the Roman governor, who, convinced of His innocence, is about to release Him, but the princes of the people cry: "We have a law; and according to the law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God" (John xix.). On Calvary we hear this significant insult: "If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." Then they who were converted by the spectacle of this divine death strike their breasts and exclaim: "In-

deed this was the Son of God" (Matth. xxvii.). Because He affirmed His divinity Christ was condemned and suffered death.

3. Jesus, not satisfied with publicly proclaiming His divinity, cites in support of His affirmation the testimony of His works: miracles, the infallible signs of truth, create faith in His words. When, for example, the Scribes and Pharisees, scandalized that He forgives sins, accuse Him of blasphemy, He contents Himself with replying: "That you may know that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins, I say to thee" (addressing the man sick of the palsy), "Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house" (Luke v. 24). Again, "Believe you not," He says elsewhere, "that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? Otherwise believe for the very work's sake" (John xiv. 11). "The works that I do in the name of My Father, they give testimony of Me" (ib. x. 25). "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not; but if I do, though you will not believe Me, believe the works: that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in the Father" (ib. x. 37, 38).

Remark.—Jesus Christ is at the same time perfect God and perfect man. Equal to the Father according to the divinity, He is less than the Father according to the humanity. The divine nature and the human are closely united in the person of the Word. "For as the rational soul and the flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ," says the Athanasian Creed. Consequently we can and we should attribute to Jesus Christ, God-man, all the properties and all the actions of both natures. Hence it is true to say of Jesus that He is eternal, and at the same time that He was born and that He died. These propositions do not contradict each other, they refer to the qualities of these two different natures: if Jesus is eternal as God, as man He is mortal. Therefore, the same person being both God and man, Jesus, though the Son of God, could call Himself the Son of man, could declare His Father greater than He,

could say that there were things that only His Father knew, that His Father had abandoned Him, etc.

It gives us pleasure to add that it is in virtue of this same law, called in theology *communicatio idiomatum*,[1] that Mary, though only a creature, is justly styled the *Mother of God*. No doubt this holy and spotless virgin did not give birth to the divine nature, but she bore a Son *who is God*. This will be her eternal honor; it also justifies the special homage and hyperdulia worship offered her throughout all Christian ages. How could a disciple, a brother of Jesus Christ, not place all confidence in her whom God chose to be the Mother of His well-beloved Son in whom He is well pleased; in her whom the Doctors and saints of the Church have been pleased to call the all-powerful advocate; in her, finally, whom Jesus, dying on the cross, bequeathed to us as mother, and whom He made so kind, so tender, so merciful that she might help us to bear with patience the trials of this life and attain a happy eternity with Him? [2]

Conclusion.—It is as evident that Jesus is truly God as that He was sent by God.[3] Hence we have only to cast ourselves at His feet, and, with hearts burning with gratitude and love, exclaim with Thomas, "My Lord and my God!"

[1] On this communication of properties or attributes see Hunter, II., n. 537.

[2] Newman, Difficulties of Angl., II., letter to Pusey; Br. W. vii. 416, viii. 59, 186; Concilio, Knowledge of Mary; Ward, Devotional Essays, 1–4; Ryder, Cath. Controversy, p. II., charge 1, § 3; Petitalot, The Virgin Mother; Jeanjacquot, Simple Explanations concerning the Most Holy Virgin; J. L. Spalding, lect. l. 8; Gans, Mariolatry; M., Oct. 1902; Card. Gibbon, Faith of O. F., ch. 14, and in A. C. Q. iii.; Hunter, II., tr. 12.

[3] To the objection: If Christ were God, the whole world would have acknowledged him as God, Picard replies: "Such an assertion takes for granted that God cannot reveal Himself except in an irresistible manner, repressing along with liberty of faith the possibility of merit" (p. 273).

Summary of the Ten Proofs. Conclusion of the First Part.

1. We have stated some of the fundamental proofs of the Christian religion. The greater number of these proofs, even if taken separately, are irresistibly convincing; one alone, duly considered, suffices to carry conviction to every honest and unprejudiced mind. To establish any truth whatever, all that is required, in fact, is one good argument; when this argument exists all the objections are necessarily of no real value; they cannot but be specious. Now here we have a host of proofs from various sources in favor of the divinity of the Christian religion, and when each one of them is so conclusive in itself, what must they be if we take them, as we should, as a magnificent whole?

How can we reasonably doubt the divinity of a religion in favor of which can be cited the universal expectation of ages anterior to the Christian era; the entire history of the Jewish people; the accomplishment of promises, prophecies, and figures; the superior character of the evangelical doctrine; the holiness of the life of its Author, the authority and great number of His miracles and His prophecies; the no less wonderful works of His apostles and disciples to whom He promised the power of working miracles; the establishment, propagation, and preservation, humanly unaccountable, of the religion which He founded; the conversion of the world to this religion, which thwarted all its passions and contradicted all the reigning ideas; the transformation of society, of laws, and of morals; the unceasing testimony of martyrs; the assent of the greatest geniuses the world ever produced; the adoration and love of noblest hearts; the beautiful fruits produced in souls by the vivifying breath of the Gospel; marvels without number of humility, of charity, of purity, and abnegation of which the world never dreamed; the successive defeat of men and systems hostile to it; the faith and piety

which sprung with new life in the midst of assaults and denials; the unexpected return of minds to the faith just when her cause seemed lost? All this, in fact, constitutes the most brilliant proof of our faith, and superabundantly justifies the belief of the innumerable generations who have chosen to follow the standard of the cross. If arguments of such a character establish only a colossal error, prostrating the greater part of the civilized world, including the greatest geniuses of mankind, at the feet of an infamous impostor, what must we think of the wisdom and goodness of God? Yes; God is wise and good, hence He has prepared numerous and convincing proofs in order that we may accept revelation, not blindly, but with an eminently reasonable assent truly worthy of Him.

2. This holy religion which Christ taught the world is binding upon all men until the end of time. The same facts which establish that God placed Himself, by means of His incarnate Son, in direct and immediate relation with man, force us to recognize the strict obligation on our part to enter into this order of grace and glory founded by Him for our benefit. No doubt in calling us to Christianity and making us His children by adoption, and heirs of heaven, God performed an act of love, but it was also an act of authority. Our sovereign Master willed that we should accept the gifts which His goodness offered us. His infinite majesty cannot but claim the glory which He expects from His chosen creature.

Moreover, our supernatural regeneration cost the Son of God, Our Saviour, so dear, that religion, which assures us the benefits of it by applying to us the merits of His blood, cannot be an institution which we are free to reject or accept. "Jesus Christ has left a creed to enlighten the world; commandments to guide it; sacraments, a sacrifice, and priesthood to sanctify it; His own representatives to rule it till the end of time. Thirty years He consecrated to His work, which was only terminated on the sorrowful tree of the cross. How

could it ever be possible to preserve our claims to heaven and yet refuse to see a dogma in this creed, a law in this decalogue, a sacrifice on this cross, and a divine institution in this Church? It would be the most groundless pretension that could be imagined." (Mgr. Bresson.) The will of the divine Legislator is manifested on this point with a clearness which leaves no room for doubt. When leaving the world He said to His apostles: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) "God," says St. Paul, "hath exalted His Son, and hath given Him a name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth" (Phil. ii. 9, 10). "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a redemption for all" (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6); and again he says that God hath chosen "to re-establish all things in Christ, . . . and hath subjected all things under His feet" (Eph. i. 10, 22). And in the Acts we read that Jesus "is the stone which was rejected by the builders, which is become the head of the corner: . . . for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (iv. 11, 12).[1]

3. The best of civilized mankind has believed in the divinity of the Christian religion. And yet we find, even among scholars, men who reject all revealed religion or who go so far as to profess a degrading and hopeless materialism. The various causes of this deplorable blindness are set forth in many works.[2]

No doubt ignorance in matters of religion is, particularly in the present day, one of the chief causes of unbelief. But

[1] MacCarthy, Sermon on Unbelief: fragment of a sermon on indifference in matters of religion.

[2] Laforet, Why Men do Not Believe; Lacordaire, conf. 15, 16, on Cath. Doctrine and the Mind; M. xlvi. 531.

the most usual cause among young men who have received a religious education is, unquestionably, immorality. For, as Mgr. Freppel recently said: "That which prevents our seeing clearly the things of God is the great predominance of the senses over the mind. The passions are like dense vapors which, rising from the depths of the conscience, place themselves between the eye of the soul and the sun of truth and intercept the rays of eternal justice. Remove this veil and light will appear, and religion will shine forth in all the splendor of its incomparable certainty."[1]

Religion curbs the passions, it commands man to rule his senses, instead of letting them rule him; it commands him, according to the beautiful expression of Descartes, to keep his heart so high that matter cannot reach him. This is what we dread in religion, this is what constrains and vexes us, and we affect not to believe it in order to be dispensed from doing what it prescribes. Nothing is more true than this celebrated saying of Euler: "If the theorems of Euclid were moral precepts, they would have been denied long ago."

But great minds are most frequently united to noble hearts. Therefore in all ages the greatest men have been men of strong faith, sincere Christians. No one certainly would class as feeble-minded men Athenagoras, Arnobius, Epiphanius, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Mintius Felix, Cyprian, Gregory, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustine, and many others, who in the first ages of the Church believed with fervent faith and displayed rare eloquence in the defence of their belief. Who would venture to tax with weak credulity Alfred the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, St. Anselm, Bossuet, Fénelon, Malebranche, Bacon, Descartes, Newton, Leibnitz, Euler, and innumerable others who have never ceased to appreciate and admire the truths of Christianity?

And even the last century, so justly proud of its admirable discoveries, includes a multitude of scholars of

[1] Lacordaire, ib., conf. 14, 17, 18, 19.

every kind who have never faltered in their complete and entire allegiance to the truths of revelation. And to mention only representatives of sciences which are frequently made to contradict revelation, there is no doubt that the testimony of men like Volta, A. M. Ampère, Elie de Beaumont, Cauchy, Biot, Hermite, Puiseux, Le Verrier, de Blainville, Gratiolet, Secchi, Thénard, J. B. Dumas, André Dumont, d'Omalius, d'Halloy, Van Beneden, and many others, is quite equal to that of men like Moleschott, Vogt, Buchner, and their companions in unbelief. It would be easy to make this list of learned Catholics of the present day much longer, but this enumeration may serve as a subsidiary proof of the truth of our holy faith.[1]

Supported by such a vast and noble company we have no reason to fear that we shall be accused of blindly or imprudently accepting revealed truth.[2] We can say in the words

[1] See references to P. II., ch. 5, art. 3.

[2] "The Pharisees of modern as of ancient times would fain persuade us that the common people are credulous, whereas only those of refined and cultivated minds can be free from error. But even if we admit this distinction, does it follow that no Christians are highly cultured men? . . . Has not every country possessed its men of sound logic, strong, good sense, of clear discernment and prudence, and of practical knowledge of life, who have not the less been good Catholics? If such men as these, placed in circumstances which enabled them . . . to form a right judgment after weighing well the arguments on both sides, have been able to arrive at a definite conclusion and to become ardent believers, surely our opponents must admit that there remains something to be said in behalf of the faith which they consider so utterly contemptible.

"Moreover, several of the boldest and most daring Protestants in Germany, France, and England have arrived at the conviction, after free inquiry and in the unconstrained exercise of their private judgment, that the Christian facts are true and that the foundations of Christianity are impregnable. The belief of thinkers and critics of this class proves very well that, though the proofs of Christianity may be assailed, they cannot be demolished. Hence the fact that some learned men do not believe in it is by no means a conclusive argument against Christianity." Picard, p. 615 f.

of the illustrious mathematician Cauchy: "I am a Christian, that is, I believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, with Tycho Brahe, Copernicus, Descartes, Newton, Fermal, Leibnitz, Pascal, Grimaldi, Euler, Gudlin, Boscowich, Gerdil; with all the great astronomers, physicians, geometricians of past ages. I am a Catholic with the majority of them, and I am ready to give a reason for my faith. My convictions are not the result of inherited prejudices, but of a profound examination. I am a sincere Catholic with Corneille, Racine, la Bruyère, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fénelon; with the most distinguished men of our age, with those who have done most for science, philosophy, and literature; with those who have been the most illustrious members of our institutions. I share the profound convictions expressed in the words, the actions, and the writings of our greatest scholars, Ruffini, Haüy, Laennec, Ampère, Pelletier, Freycinet, Coriolis; and if I refrain, out of regard for their modesty, from mentioning others, I can say at least that it gave me great pleasure to find all the nobility and generosity of the Christian faith in my illustrious friends, in the inventor of crystallography (Canon Haüy), in the celebrated navigator of the Uranie (Claude Marie de Freycinet), and in the immortal author of electro-dynamics (André-Marie Ampère)."

PART SECOND.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL NOTIONS.

I. Our Object.

Relying on the testimony of the Old and the New Testament, historic documents of incontestable authority, we have conclusively proved the divinity of the Christian religion. But where is the true Christianity, preached and imposed upon mankind by Jesus Christ, to be found? This is the important question we have now to solve.

The Christian religion, instituted to be practised by all men, does not and cannot exist in an abstract state. It is presented to us by a concrete society called the Church, a visible society, which professes the doctrines of Christ and observes His laws.

There are many religious societies, each one of which claims to be charged with the divine mission of preserving in all its integrity the teaching of Christ and transmitting it from age to age to the end of the world. Nevertheless it is evident, as we shall soon show, that, among these churches, differing so widely in dogmas, in precepts, and in worship, one only is the true Church; the others can be only sects, condemned by Jesus Christ, whose name they falsely bear.

The proper object of this second part of our work is to enable us to discern with certainty the Church founded by Christ, to show that only the Church of Rome, which has the Pope as its supreme head, has a right to our belief, our respect, our obedience, and our love.

The order of this demonstration is as follows:

Having given some general notions of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, of her nature, end, constitution, etc., we shall show that this Church is the Roman Catholic Church, to the exclusion of all other Christian communions.

We shall then speak of some of her prerogatives, of her supreme head, and of her relations with the State. Finally, we must defend the Church against certain false accusations made particularly by historians, and show what she has done, and never ceases to do, for the civilization and happiness of nations.

Remarks.—1st. We have no need to dwell here upon Christian communions which have disappeared many centuries ago, leaving hardly a trace in history. St. Augustine enumerated in his time more than eighty-four heresies almost completely extinct; and in the sixteenth century Bellarmin, after mentioning two hundred heresies previous to Luther, added: "All these sects have perished; in the East there are a few Nestorians and Eutychians, and in Bohemia a few belated followers of John Huss." It is very evident that we have no need to revive these errors long buried in merited oblivion. It will be sufficient to compare with Catholicity the churches which have preserved some vitality, that is, certain Protestant sects, and the schismatic Greek churches. The triumphant conclusion of this parallel applies more forcibly still to other anti-Catholic sects.

2d. In this treatise the discussion takes, as we see, an entirely different ground from that of the first part of the work. There we assumed that we were dealing with infidels, unbelievers, and rationalists, who refuse to acknowledge the divinity of Christ's mission and the obligation to embrace

the religion established by Him. For that reason the only proofs we cited were historic documents and the truths of reason. Now the discussion is particularly with schismatic Greeks and those of our separated brethren, who, like us, believe in the divinity of Christ and admit that the Holy Scripture is inspired. Therefore we may quote as decisive arguments texts of the Old and the New Testament which we both regard as the words of infallible truth. Even those who, unfortunately, reject the authority of the Scriptures can receive them nevertheless, as well as the writings and documents of the Fathers of the Church, as historic records of incontestable value.

II. The Church.

1. Definition of the Church.—Writers assign to this word "church" (ἐκκλήσια, assembly) sometimes a broader and sometimes a more restricted meaning. In the broader sense of the term the Church is an assembly which embraces all the faithful servants of God, whether they are still combating on earth, or expiating their faults in the fires of purgatory, or triumphing in heaven, including at times even the angels. In the more restricted sense the Church is only an assembly of the faithful who are combating upon earth (the Church militant). Taken in this second acceptation the Church may include all the true adorers of God from the beginning of the world until the end of time; all, in fact, who have believed or will believe in the revealed religion, essentially the same in its three different phases. Nevertheless the word church generally designates the *Christian* Church as it exists in the world since Christ came to give the final perfection to supernatural religion.

In the present treatise we are considering the Church in this last or more restricted sense. Thus understood it may be defined as the society of the faithful instituted by Christ to preserve His doctrine, observe His laws, and thus attain the final end of man, or eternal life.

2. The Christian Religion Constitutes a Real Society, a Church.—Rationalists, we have seen, do not refuse to recognize in Jesus Christ the ideal type of human perfection; but however pure and striking His virtue, He is, they allege, only a simple mortal and the Christian religion is not His work; it has nothing in common with Him but the doctrine which it professes. But if this be true, how was it possible for the followers of Christ to form a society and constitute a Church? Here is the explanation which they hazard on the subject. Christians accustomed to study unceasingly the doctrine of this Wise Man, whose life and teachings they admired, and being accustomed, moreover, to indulge in philosophic speculations, and having become very numerous, they were naturally led to form a body, or society. For the idea of Christ and His doctrine they gradually substituted that of a society founded by Him, and as they recalled the ancient glory of the synagogue they took refuge under its shadow until they felt sufficiently strong to separate from it. Thus certain rationalists insist that it was only in the second century that the Christian Church dared to proclaim its existence and appear in public, and that it was also at this period that the gospels were written.

This was the theory introduced by Strauss in Germany, and adopted in France by Littré, under the name of mythic rationalism. Of course in the eyes of such men the supernatural facts, the miracles attributed to Christ by Holy Scripture, are only myths, figurative impressions, purely intellectual conceptions.

In the first part of the present work we have answered these last assertions as well as the assertions relative to the composition of the gospels. It now remains for us to confute the false assertions in regard to the establishment of the Church by demonstrating the following thesis. But let us first explain some of the terms.

We understand by the word society a collection of men uniting their individual forces for the attainment of a common

end by the employment of common means. Hence we find in every society four necessary elements: the *members*, their united *efforts*, common *means*, and a common *end*.

The *special nature* of the society is determined by the end it has in view. The end of domestic society is different from that of civil society or that of religious society. This end is what unites men into societies and determines the means they use in pursuit of their purpose.

One of the most *indispensable elements of any society* intended to last is *authority;* besides being the moral bond which holds the members together it presides over them all, incites, moderates, directs, and reforms, according as it is necessary for the good of all or the individual. Thus in every society authority is invested with certain prerogatives proportioned to the end to be attained by its subjects.

Now we shall briefly prove that Jesus founded the Christian society; in other words, that He Himself gathered His disciples into one body in order to pursue a common end (their salvation) by common means (preaching, worship, sacraments), and under authority divinely established (the heads appointed by Him).

Thesis.—Jesus Christ Truly and Personally Founded His Religion under the Form of a real Society, of a Church.

We shall be satisfied here with merely mentioning the arguments; the development which they allow belongs rightly to the following theses.[1]

First Argument.—We learn from the Gospel, 1st. That Jesus Christ solemnly promised to institute a Church when choosing among His twelve apostles one to whom He gave the symbolic name of Peter. He said to him: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This promise

[1] Manning, Religio Viatoris, ch. iv.; Grounds of Faith, l. 2; Schanz, III., ch. 2, 3; Hunter, I., tr. 4, ch. 1–3; C. W. xxvi. 434, 653; Lockhart, Old Rel., ch. 22 ff.; Picard, p. II., ch. 5.

already furnishes an incontestable proof, for Jesus Christ could not fail in His word.

2d. That He *executed His promise* and founded this Church. We read, in fact, that He gave to His apostles the power and mission to preach the Gospel to every creature; to administer the sacraments; to govern the faithful; and that He promised to be with them until the end of time. At the head of the apostles He placed Simon, to whom He gave *universal jurisdiction* over the whole Church. This certainly was founding a religious society, a *Church*.

3d. We learn from the same Gospel and the Book of Acts that the apostles, after the Ascension, fulfilled the mission that they had received: they preached the doctrine of Christ, they observed His laws, they increased from day to day the number of the disciples and governed them under the guidance of Peter, who had been appointed their supreme head.

Second Argument. (*Of Prescription.*)—The existence itself of the Church proves its Christian origin. Just as the secular existence of a nation, a civil society, proves the reality of its foundation, so the existence of the Church, that is, of that society distinct from all others, and which from all time has been called the Church of Christ—an existence uninterrupted through all the Christian ages—proves the reality of its Christian institution. By her name, her worship, her temples, her sacraments, her ministers, her organizations, her general and special councils, the uninterrupted succession of her first pastors, her marvellous institutions, her moral and civilizing influence, the Church has never ceased for nineteen centuries to attest that she was originally founded by Jesus Christ.[1]

Remarks.—We shall find the preceding argument still more convincing if we weigh the following reflections.

1st. Christianity is not a purely abstract conception like

[1] C. W. xxxi., xxxii. (Genesis of Cath. Ch.), xxxiii., xxxiv. (Christian Jerusalem).

Plato's ideal republic; it is not simply a collection of documents and moral principles offered to the admiration of the curious, but a living, concrete reality. The word religion means a society professing religion, consequently a Church. Therefore, the Christian religion and the Christian Church are one and the same thing; one is only the visible manifestation of the other; therefore if Jesus founded His religion He founded His Church, that is, the visible society of those who profess His doctrine.[1]

2d. The proofs by which we have established the divinity of the Christian religion apply, the greater part of them, directly to the Church. Thus it was Christianity, not in the abstract, but as forming a society, a Church, which was predicted and prescribed by the oracles and the prophets; it was the establishment of the Church which was marked by the seal of miracles; it was her divine origin which was attested by the blood of martyrs, which was miraculously established and preserved, and which produced the most marvellous fruits of virtue in souls and the richest blessings to mankind.

COROLLARY. *The obligation of being a member of the Church in order to be saved.*[2]—This obligation readily follows from the preceding thesis. There are societies which are *voluntary* and *optional;* except in special circumstances no one is obliged to enter them; if we assume their obligations, it is to enjoy the advantages which they afford. Such are financial societies, such also are religious orders. If after we have entered societies of this kind we are obliged to remain, it is because we cannot leave them without violating the vows which we have voluntarily taken.

It is quite otherwise with the religious society, the Church.

[1] Br. W. xii. 59; J. L. Spalding, Lectures, l. 10.

[2] Dr. Edw. Hawarden, Charity and Truth; Hay, Sincere Christian, vol. ii., append.; Schanz, I. I., ch. 9; Ryder (C. T. S. vol. v.); Balmes, Letters to a Sceptic, l. 16; Br. W. v. 571; C. W. xxxi. 481, xlvii. 145, xlviii. 509; M. lvii. 363, lxxiii. 236, 344.

It is a strict obligation for every man to enter it, for, as we have already seen, every man is obliged to enter the supernatural order, and this order is attained through the Church of Christ. We have, moreover, the formal command of Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church: "Go preach the Gospel to all nations, baptizing them. . . . He that will not believe shall be condemned." This was always Catholic belief, the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Councils. "Faith teaches us," says Pius IX., "that outside the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church there is no salvation; it is the only ark of salvation, and whosoever will not enter it will be the victim of the deluge." Let us add here a remark which we shall develop more fully later: they who, through no fault of their own, are ignorant of the existence of the true Church and the obligation to form a part thereof, are not punished for not entering it. We shall state in its proper place the conditions under which such persons may form part of the soul of the Church and enter heaven (ch. 4, art. 1, IV.).

3. THE END OF THE CHURCH.—The proper and direct end of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, or the end which He proposed in instituting the Church, was to save souls and to lead men to eternal salvation. Nothing is more evident than this in the gospels and throughout the New Testament. Moreover, the Church, as history proves, has never, either in theory or practice, claimed any other end. She has, indeed, contributed to the welfare of individuals and of governments; but this was an *indirect* though natural effect of her teachings.

Considering this supernatural end, the Church may be said to be a supernatural society, a society of souls, though it is no less true that she is a visible and corporal society. In fact when she speaks to the soul it is through the organs of the body; the means she employs, preaching and sacraments, are corporal and sensible means; the authority which governs her is a physical and tangible authority.

This shows the absurdity of the following sophism of certain Protestants. The Church, they argue, is a society of souls; hence she is wholly spiritual; therefore they must reject the Church of Rome, because she has a Pope, bishops, sacraments, and religious ceremonies.

4. Constitution of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.—In every State or civil society there are two orders of citizens, those who command and those who obey. Similarly, in the Church or society founded by Jesus Christ there are two *constituent elements*, those who teach and command, those who hear and obey. The first constitute the teaching Church—they are called the pastors, the ministry, the hierarchy; the second constitute that portion of the Church who are taught—they are called the faithful or laity, the fold or flock.

We distinguish, generally, three forms of government: monarchical, aristocratic, and republican. The form of government imposed upon the Church by her divine Founder is monarchical. In fact Peter, as we shall prove later, was invested with the primacy, that is, with supreme power, which he was to transmit to his successors. But just as in civil monarchy there must be heads of provinces, chiefs or governors subordinate to the ruling power or sovereign, so in the ecclesiastical monarchy there is one supreme head who is the Pope, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and in the various dioceses subordinate heads who are bishops. The Church therefore is, by divine right, a monarchy, wisely seconded by a sort of subordinate aristocracy.[1]

Hence the folly of our separated brethren, the majority of whom claim that the Church is a society where all are equal; that the ecclesiastical power is vested in the multitude of the faithful; that as the faithful, *en masse*, cannot profitably exercise this power, deputies or delegates must be chosen to act for them; but the people, they claim, have always the right to choose these deputies, to limit their power, and

[1] Br. W. viii. 527, xii. 79; Lacordaire, conf. 2 on the Church.

to depose them when they think proper. It is clearly evident from simply reading the Gospel that such a system is absolutely contrary to the will of the divine Founder of the Church. This will be clearly demonstrated farther on.

5. The Church is a Perfect Society.[1]—A society to be complete or perfect must possess in itself all the means necessary for attaining its end. Such, for example, is civil society. A society to be perfect, 1st, must be independent and form no part of any other society. Thus a financial society which forms a part of the state or government is an incomplete society. 2d. It must have no end directly subordinate to that of any other society: the end of military societies, or armies, is evidently subordinate to the good of civil society. 3d. It must possess in itself all the means necessary for its subsistence, its preservation, and the accomplishment of its end.

Now it is God's will that the Church possess all these conditions. 1st. She forms no constituent part of any other society. 2d. Her end, so far from being subordinate, is incomparably superior to that of all other societies; moreover, every well-ordered society must ultimately be subservient to the end of the Church, which is the supreme end of man, eternal salvation. 3d. Finally, in virtue of her constitution and the assistance of divine grace, which she never lacks, the Church has every means of attaining her end. Hence she is, as we shall prove later on, a perfect society.

[1] See references below to ch. 3, art. 4. "The Church was founded by her divine Author as a true and perfect society, not confined within any territorial limits, nor subject to any civil government, but free in the exercise of her power and rights all over the world." Pius IX., Allocut. Dec. 17, 1860. The Church "is distinguished, and differs, from civil society; and what is of highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right divine, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself and by itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action." Leo XIII., Encycl. on Christian Const. of States.

For the rest, a short glance at history may convince us of the fact. During the first three centuries the Church never ceased to pursue her end, the sanctification of souls. She spread and asserted herself among the nations not only without any help or assistance from the civil power, but in spite of the most cruel persecutions on the part of this same power.[1] Besides, how could the Church, being a society of a supernatural order, receive from any purely natural society the means required to attain her end? Supernatural means alone bear the right proportion to the attainment of an end which is eminently supernatural, namely, the eternal salvation of souls.

[1] "The Catholic Church has its charter directly from God, it came immediately out of the hands of God, not through princes nor through people. It was first established when all princes and, we may say, all nations were against it. This circumstance was providential, not only inasmuch as it served to show the power of God, . . . but also because the Church in its origin neither required, nor received, nor waited for any consent from existing political states." O'Reilly, S.J., p. 24. See also his excellent remarks p. 154 ff.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF ROME IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.[1]

In the preceding chapter we have seen that Jesus Christ founded a Church of which every one is obliged to be a member under pain of failing to realize his last end. We must now enter upon the capital question of this second part, that is, determine which among the Christian societies we have before us was truly founded by Jesus Christ, preserves His doctrine in all its purity, and represents Him upon earth. In a matter where any mistake involves such deplorable consequences to our souls we cannot take too much precaution to discern the false from the true.

Outside of the Catholic Church we find in the bosom of Christianity two great religious divisions claiming to be the true religion of Christ: heresy and schism. Heresy is a Christian sect which rejects one part of the Christian dogma formerly universally admitted, and retains another part. Schism is the separating of a religious body from the central government formerly universally acknowledged, and the constituting itself a special centre and separate government.

We shall first set forth the distinct marks or notes by which the true Church of Christ may be recognized among

[1] Spalding, J. M., Evidences, etc.; Allnat, The Church and the Sects; Schanz, III.; Gibbons, Faith of our Fathers; Lindsay, De Ecclesia, etc.; Gildea, in C. T. S. xvi.; Preston, Protestantism and the Church; Moriarty, The Keys of Heaven; Ricards, Cath. Christianity; Bagshawe, Credentials of the Church; Br. W. viii. 552; Hunter, I., tr. 4; McLaughlin, Divine Plan; Van den Hagen, Where is the True Church?; Cox, The Pillar and Ground of Truth.

the various Christian communions, and show that the Catholic or Roman Church, who has as head the Roman Pontiff, possesses all these notes. We shall then prove that all other Christian communions (Protestant or schismatic) lack these marks, although this last proof is not indispensable. The divinity of the Roman Catholic Church involves of itself the illegitimacy of all sects. Lastly, in the Primacy of St. Peter we shall discover a new mark by which the exclusive truth of the Church of Rome may be readily recognized.

ART. I.—NOTES OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.

The true religion, binding upon all men, exists only in the Church founded by Jesus Christ. God wills the salvation of all, hence it is absolutely necessary that all be able to discern the true Church of Christ among the various religious societies claiming Him as founder.[1] The notes of which we are about to treat will enable us to make this indispensable discovery.

I. Of the Notes in General.

Definition.—We call notes of the Church sensible and permanent characters proper to her, by means of which the true Church may be readily and unerringly recognized by all men. Let us explain this definition in detail.

1st. *Sensible characters*, that is, characters exteriorly perceptible (visible). It is evident that qualities which, though real, are not patent to our eyes cannot help us to discern the true Church.[2]

2d. *Special characters proper to the Church.* As the celebrated Bellarmin says: "If I wish to describe a man whom

[1] Spalding, Evid., l. 6; Hunter, l. c., ch. 9; Br. W. 7. 476. A rich collection of testimonies from the Fathers on the Marks of the Church is found in the excellent work "The Faith of Catholics," vol. i.

[2] "Though the Church possesses many properties, not all of these are *marks* in the technical sense of the word." Scheeben, II., p. 341.

you have never seen, and enable you to recognize him immediately at sight, I should not say he has two hands, two ears, for these things are common to all men."

3d. *Permanent characters*, that is, those which continue throughout all ages in the Church. This is an immediate consequence of what we have just said. If it never ceases to be a strict obligation for all men to enter the Church, the only way of salvation, it is sovereignly important to be able always and at all times to recognize this way of salvation; hence the characters which guide us must be constant and permanent.

4th. *Means by which the true Church may be readily and unerringly recognized by all men.* In fact it was for this end that God willed that His Church should be invested with these characters. Now as all, the ignorant as well as the learned, are obliged to enter this ark of salvation, and as the greater part of mankind is incapable of laborious examination or profound study, God mercifully provides in these notes an easy guide for all in search of truth.[1] At the same time the conviction which the notes afford varies according to the penetration of each mind. But the conviction of the scholar, though more enlightened and the result of deeper reflection, is essentially of the same nature as that of ordinary minds.

Remark.—It follows from what we have just said that among the characters necessary to the Church there are some which can in no way serve as notes; such are indefecti-

[1] "It is plain that if the Church is to be an available guide to poor as well as rich, unlearned as well as learned, its notes and tokens must be very simple, obvious, and intelligible. They must not depend on education or be brought out by abstruse reasoning, but must at once affect the imagination and interest the feelings. They must bear with them a sort of internal evidence which supersedes further discussion and makes the truth self-evident." These evidences of the Church need not be "such as cannot possibly be explained away or put out of sight, but such as, if allowed room to display themselves, will persuade the many that she is what she professes to be, God's ordained teacher in attaining heaven." (Newman, Essays, I., n. 4.)

bility and infallibility, for the reason that they are not exterior, palpable characters more easily recognized than the Church itself. On the contrary, it is only after we have discerned the true Church that we recognize its indispensable qualities of infallibility and indefectibility.

II. Division of the Notes.

All the notes of the Church are real properties and positive characters; yet we divide them according to their demonstrative value into positive and negative notes. The *negative* notes (if they can be called notes) are those the absence of which proves efficaciously that a society is not the Church of Christ, but the presence of which does not of itself prove the true Church. Let us cite for example certain notes generally mentioned by Protestants: perfect integrity of doctrine, loyalty of preachers, legitimate use of the sacraments, just and peaceful means of propagation. These characters are doubtless indispensable to the true Church; but while they may exist, at least in theory, for a time in a dissenting sect, they are as difficult to recognize as the Church itself. The *positive* notes have quite a different value; they belong exclusively to the true Church of Christ. Once we prove their existence in a religious society we are authorized to conclude that this society is the true Church.

Apologists differ in their enumeration of negative as well as positive notes. We shall speak only of the four positive notes generally admitted, and enumerated in the Creed of Nicæa or Constantinople inserted in the liturgy of the Mass: Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity.

III. Positive Notes.

A. *Unity.*

This unity is twofold: it includes, 1st, unity of doctrine and of faith, which consists in the universal assent of the faithful to all that the Church teaches as revealed by Jesus Christ.

2d. Unity of ministry and of communion; that is, the union of all the faithful by participation in the same sacraments and in the celebration of the same worship under the guidance of their bishops, and particularly of the Roman Pontiff.

To disturb the unity of faith by rejecting a point of doctrine is *heresy;* to disturb the unity of communion by rejecting the authority of lawful heads is *schism.*[1]

I. UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND BELIEF.

Thesis.—Jesus Christ willed that His Church should be one in Doctrine and Belief; that is, He made it an Obligation for Pastors to Teach, and consequently for the Faithful to Believe, Unreservedly, all the Truths revealed by Him.

FIRST ARGUMENT, DERIVED FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE.—*a.* "Go," Jesus said to His apostles, "and teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Christ, we see, makes no exception; His very words make exception impossible: "You will teach them to observe *omnia quaecumque mandavi,* all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" He imposed, consequently, faith in *all* His doctrines no less than in *all* His precepts. Again He says: "Preach the Gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16). If it were sufficient to believe only certain truths, and we were free to believe or not to believe others, Jesus certainly would have declared those that were of obligation, since we are obliged to accept them under pain of eternal loss. Nor does Jesus make any exception when He says; "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me." And again: "He that will not hear the Church, let him be

[1] On *Schism* consult Harper, I., essay 2, § 6; Hunter, I., n. 216; M. lxxxii. 1; Br. W. iv. 573; Botalla, Papacy and Schism; Lockhart, Old Rel., ch. 15, 30, 31.

to thee as a heathen and as a publican" (Luke x. 16; Matt. xviii. 17).

b. The language of the apostles is the same as that of their Master. We do not find in the Epistles of St. Paul anything intimating the slightest distinction between dogma and dogma, between truth and truth; he announces the doctrine of Christ, nothing less, nothing more. He pronounces anathema upon any one who would preach anything else, were it even he himself, or an angel from heaven. He conjures the Romans to avoid those who cause dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine they have learned. He beseeches the Galatians to do the same, and to avoid schisms and heresies without distinction, under pain of damnation. St. John speaks in the same manner; according to him, whoever remains not in the doctrine of Christ, but rejects it, does not possess God: "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you" (2 John i. 10).

SECOND ARGUMENT, DERIVED FROM THE TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS AND COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.—*a.* Pressed by the irresistible arguments of Catholic theologians, the French Calvinist Jurieu, in the seventeenth century, introduced into the doctrine of Jesus Christ a distinction hitherto absolutely unknown, viz., fundamental articles which we are obliged to believe, and non-fundamental articles which we are free to reject. He claimed that this distinction was generally admitted during the first four centuries of the Church, and that it was only in the fifth century that it was rejected and the faithful thenceforth obliged to believe all the dogmas revealed by Jesus Christ.[1] It is very evi-

[1] We do not think it necessary to refute at great length this distinction invented for the needs of a desperate cause and eagerly adopted by the Protestants of that day. It can be easily demonstrated that this system, which has, moreover, been generally abandoned, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures upon which Protestants claim to rely exclusively; that it destroys the authority of Jesus Christ; that it is contrary to the belief of all Christians prior to the

dent that if such a change had taken place then, it would have drawn forth innumerable protests from the bishops and Fathers of the Church, as well as from the faithful and from heretics. The innumerable Councils, general or special, convened to decide questions of dogma attest the vigilance employed at that time to preserve the doctrine in all its purity and integrity. Moreover, contemporaneous history, which relates in minutest detail the smallest heresies, makes no mention of any protest or charge of this nature. And what is more, no Catholic or heretic, or even Protestant, before Jurieu, was aware of such an innovation, nor did any one ever think of reproaching the Church with such a departure. As a matter of fact the Church has never varied on this point, and consequently all tradition condemns the theory.

b. Moreover, it is absolutely false that the Fathers and Popes of the first four centuries taught the distinction, which was the tardy invention of Jurieu's imagination. On the contrary, when they treated of the doctrine of the Church and the obligation of accepting it, they employed universal terms which imply no restriction. They insist that what is to be taught and to be believed is the doctrine of Christ; that he who teaches anything else is a heretic; that he who believes otherwise shares in his heresy; and that they are

seventeenth century; finally, that it is arbitrary and impracticable. How will Protestants determine which are fundamental articles, recognizing, as they do, no other rule of interpreting the word of God than private judgment and individual reason? If, according to Jurieu, the safest rule is to admit as fundamental and necessary for salvation only what all Christians have believed unanimously and still believe all over the world, there are absolutely no more fundamental doctrines left in matters of religion. Is there any one dogma which has not been rejected by heretics? Moreover, this system tells against Protestants themselves, and condemns their separation from the Catholic Church. In fact, since this Church has always held and still holds articles which they declare fundamental, what reason have they for separating from her? *

*Br. W. vi. 269; Hunter, I., n. 219.

both excluded from the Church and from salvation. The Fathers and bishops, even outside the Councils, who have taught this, are very numerous. Cardinal Gousset in his Dogmatic Theology reproduces the testimony of twenty-one, from St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, disciples of the apostles, to St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Ambrose, all of whom lived before the fifth century.

THIRD ARGUMENT, DERIVED FROM REASON.—Common sense itself enables us to recognize that it cannot be a matter of equal indifference whether we believe that there are seven sacraments or that there are less; that confession is necessary for the remission of sin or that it is optional; that Jesus Christ is really or only figuratively present in the Eucharist. No one would venture to affirm that he who adores the consecrated Host and he who tramples it under foot are equally pleasing to God and true disciples of Jesus Christ; that it is equally allowable to believe that faith without works is sufficient for salvation, and that faith without works is dead and of no avail for salvation. Religions professing doctrines so opposite cannot be one and the same religion, teaching the one and indivisible doctrine of Christ. Yet this, notwithstanding it is so manifestly contrary to good sense, is what our opponents advance.

II. UNITY OF MINISTRY OR GOVERNMENT.

REMARKS.—1st. We have here a question of fact: Did Jesus Christ confide to the Pope and the bishops, and to no others, not only the ministry of the word which preserves the unity of faith, but also the ministry of the sacraments, the regulation of worship and of all the details of religious government, from which arises the unity of communion?

2d. Protestants recognize, it is true, the existence of a certain ministry in the Church of Christ; but with them this ministry has no authority to bind the conscience of the faithful. In fact they claim for every individual Christian the right to pronounce final judgment in religious questions,

and to decide what he must believe and what he may reject. Nor is this ministry, they claim, limited only to bishops united with, and subordinate to the Roman Pontiff, but it is legitimately exercised by every pastor whom the people are pleased to recognize, on condition, however, that the pastor in preaching, and in the administration of the sacraments, does not reject any of their fundamental articles.

3d. As to the Greek schismatics, they deny the primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome in the exercise of the ministry and, consequently, the obligation on the part of the bishops and their flocks to form part of the Roman communion.

Thesis.—Jesus Christ has Established in the Church an Authority which He Confided to the Apostles and to which all the Faithful must Submit; consequently whosoever Separates Himself from their Ministry is Guilty of Schism and thereby Excluded from the Church.

First Argument, from the Scriptures.—*a.* Jesus declares that He sends His apostles as His Father hath sent Him. He orders them to preach the Gospel, to administer baptism, and to teach all that He taught them, promising to be with them until the consummation of the world. He makes Peter the supreme head and the foundation of His Church; He gives him the keys of the kingdom of heaven and declares that all that Peter shall decide in the exercise of his ministry shall be ratified in heaven; He orders him to feed His lambs and His sheep, that is, the whole flock, which is the Church.

Again, Jesus, speaking one day to His apostles and the disciples whom He associated with them, gave them practical lessons of great importance, among which is one which has immediate reference to the present question. "If thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother; and if he will not hear thee, take with thee

one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church; and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matth. xviii. 15, 16, 17.) The witnesses of whom Jesus speaks here are not to be called to pronounce sentence, but simply to sustain by their presence the protest of the one demanding redress. And though He adds, "tell the Church," Jesus does not mean a union of the faithful, but of the heads established in the Church to settle such questions. Thus nowhere do we find, either in the Scriptures or in the ecclesiastical history of the first ages, that the faithful were ever convened in council to decide questions of this nature. Moreover, the words of the Master which immediately follow those we have just cited exclude all doubt in this matter: "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." It is evident that these words, which He had already addressed to Peter alone, referred, not to the congregation of the faithful, but to those in whom He had vested His authority, and associated with Peter in the government of His Church. Now the question here is not a question of faith, but simply of *spiritual direction*, the reparation of an injury committed by one brother against another. Jesus nevertheless says very clearly that if the guilty one refuse to *submit*, he must be considered as a heathen and a publican, that is, as no longer forming a part of His Church.

Hence there exists in the Church a ministry not only for preaching, but for government; and this ministry is confided only to the heads established by Jesus Christ, whom the faithful are obliged to obey under pain of being cut off from the body of the faithful.

b. The same ministry is affirmed by the Apostle St. Paul in several of his epistles. He tells the Ephesians that God has appointed "some apostles, and some prophets, and other

some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God; . . . that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine." He preaches to the Galatians union, concord, and obedience, ranking schisms, which he calls sects, with the works of the flesh which exclude men from the kingdom of heaven. Elsewhere he orders the bishops, whom the Holy Spirit, he says, hath appointed to govern the Church of Christ, to take heed to themselves and their flocks; for he knows that after his departure ravening wolves will steal among them and will not spare the flock, and men will arise among them who will pervert doctrine, and draw disciples after them. (Eph. iv.; Gal. vi. 20; Acts xx. 28.)

Here, certainly, is a ministry clearly defined as to its origin, which is the will of God; as to its depositaries, who are the heads of the Church; as to its object, which is the government of the faithful. Now if the faithful were not bound to submit to this ministry, why does it exist, and why should refusal to recognize and submit to it exclude us from the kingdom of heaven?

Second Argument, derived from the Teaching of the Fathers in the First Ages.—Pope St. Clement, who was the disciple and companion of the great Apostle, wrote the Corinthians an admirable letter to suppress a schism which had broken out at Corinth. The letter was of such exceptional authority that for a long time in the Churches of the East it was read with the Holy Scriptures. It ought to be quoted entire, but we cannot do more than give a summary of it. He calls the dissension which was dividing the Corinthians an impious and detestable schism unworthy of God's elect. You will walk faithfully in the ways of the Lord, he tells them, by being submissive to your pastors, loving to obey rather than to command. It is just

and reasonable that we submit to God instead of imitating those who, moved by a detestable jealousy, have given an example of pride and revolt. He adds that we must obey our pastors according to the position, the rank, and the measure of the gift which God has imparted to each one in the spiritual edifice of the Church; that God sent Jesus Christ, and that Jesus Christ sent the apostles. These faithful ministers, having received orders from the lips of their Master, preached in the cities and in the villages; they chose men among the first-fruits of the infant Church, and after having tried them by the light of the Holy Spirit with which they were filled, they established them priests and deacons over those who were to accept the Gospel, and ordained that after their death other men tried in like manner should succeed them in the ministry. He says finally that the words pronounced against Judas by Jesus must be applied to the authors of the schism: Woe to these men! it were better that they had not been born.

Let us remark that the doctrine so clearly formulated in this chapter goes back to the time of the apostles of whom St. Clement was a disciple, and consequently to Jesus Christ. Though presented by the Bishop of Rome, it was received without protest by the Churches of the East. Therefore it was universally known and admitted in the first centuries, and was regarded, not as a new doctrine, but as coming from Jesus Christ.

We could cite much more testimony quite as conclusive from St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and others. (See Faith of Catholics, vol. i.)

B. *Sanctity.*

I. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL.

If we are satisfied with vague and general terms we may say that Protestants as well as Catholics recognize sanctity

as a necessary character of the Church. They hold with us that Jesus wished His Church to be holy, and that He established it only to make men holy. This is a point, moreover, which they could hardly dispute in face of St. Paul's formal declaration to the Ephesians: "Christ loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it; . . . that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 25, 26, 27). And again, that God established a ministry "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," which He elsewhere calls the Church (Eph. iv. 12; Col. i. 24).

But when there is a question of explaining in *what this sanctity consists*, Protestants either exaggerate or minimize it, and thus fall into two opposite errors. The first class confound the sanctity of the Church with the sanctity of each of its members, and claim that only just souls, who, moreover, are known only to God, form a part of the Church of Christ. Others are content with the ordinary and mediocre sanctity common to all the members of the Church, and reject as foreign to the spirit of the Gospel all that breathes of heroism and perfection, particularly the vows and life of religious orders. They deny particularly all miracles in favor of eminent sanctity.

The Church's teaching on this point, of which the following is a summary, lies between the two extremes. We maintain that the Church is holy because her Author is holy and the source itself of all holiness; because her end is to make men holy; because the means she employs, her dogmas, her ethics, and her sacraments, are holy in themselves and lead to holiness; because, finally, she has produced in all ages members distinguished by sanctity, some of them—those who faithfully followed her guidance—by eminent sanctity.

Thesis.—The Church of Christ is not Composed Exclusively of Men Just in the Sight of God.

First Argument, derived from the Teaching of Jesus Christ.—The figures under which Jesus represents His Church invariably present it to us as composed of just and of sinners, as including the wheat and the chaff, the faithful and the unfaithful servant, the wise and the prudent virgins; as the field where the tares are mingled with the good grain until the days of the harvest; as a net cast into the sea and gathering all kinds of fish, good and bad, while only the good are retained and the bad rejected; as a vineyard where the barren fig-tree is allowed to remain with the fruit-bearing trees, in the hope that it will one day bear fruit.

Second Argument, derived from the Conduct of the Apostles.—Thus did the apostles, instructed by Jesus, interpret holiness. We see them in the exercise of their ministry recalling to their duty Christians whose conduct did not correspond to their faith; they are far from treating the erring as strangers to the Church. St. Paul, when he excommunicates the scandalous sinner of Corinth and the heretics Hymeneus and Alexander, does not regard the other sinners, whom he has not cut off, as banished from the Church (1 Cor. v.; 1 Tim. i. 20).

II. The Sanctity of the Church Considered as a Note.

We have just seen that the Church is holy in various respects. At the same time these different kinds of sanctity are not all equally palpable and appreciable; many of them serve only as negative notes.

The holiness specially regarded as a positive note of the Church is the holiness of its members, and particularly the heroic sanctity of many among them. This character is easily proved, for it is confirmed by striking miracles which are not accidental, transitory facts, but the fulfilment of

promises frequently uttered by Jesus Christ and limited to no time. "He that believeth in Me," said Our Saviour, "the works that I do he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do." And again: "These signs shall follow them that believe: in My name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover" (John xiv. 12; Mark xvi. 17, 18).

C. *Catholicity.*

Catholic means universal. The application of this word to the Church means that at every period of her existence, after the adequate diffusion of the Gospel, she must extend *morally* throughout the whole world, and be *everywhere the same.*

EVERYWHERE THE SAME; for true Catholicity supposes unity of doctrine and of communion, otherwise the Church in China, for example, would not be the same as the Church existing in Brazil; and it would be false to say that it is one and the same Church in Brazil and in China. Hence it is evident that a collection of sects having nothing in common but a name (it is well known that this is the present condition of Protestantism), even though its various elements are spread throughout the entire world, cannot merit the name of *Catholic or universal religion.*

Catholicity may be considered absolutely, in itself; or relatively, that is, in comparison with the diffusion of dissenting sects.

a. Taken in an absolute sense it does not require that the Church exist in all parts of the world without exception, still less that it include in its bosom the entire human race. St. Matthew says clearly that when the Gospel shall be preached to all nations the end of the world will be at hand. Hence there is no question of a physical, but a moral universality.

To justify its name of Catholic it suffices that the Church include a great part of mankind, and that it exist in the greater part of the world in a manner to be recognized in all the other parts. "It is necessary," says the illustrious theologian Suarez, "that the Church shed throughout the world a certain universal splendor, so that her light may shine everywhere, and she may be distinguished from all heretical sects." A proper understanding of the Scriptures, and tradition from the earliest ages, show that this moral universality is all that is required.

b. Nor is it required that the Church exceed in numbers all the other Christian communities taken collectively, but that it outnumber each one of them taken singly.

Thesis.—Catholicity is an Indispensable Attribute of the True Church.

Proof Drawn from Holy Scriptures.—*a.* It is certain that the ancient prophecies concerning the Messias and His work, which we have cited elsewhere, represent the Church as destined to spread throughout the world. It will be the light of nations; the light destined to shine in the utmost parts of the earth; the house into which God will gather all the nations; a high mountain which shall fill all the earth. The Messias is to have nations for His inheritance, and His kingdom will extend to the utmost parts of the earth. The kings of the earth are to adore Him, all the nations are to obey Him. From the rising to the setting of the sun His name will be glorified by all nations, and in every place there will be offered to His name a pure oblation. All these passages, and many others too long to quote, are inexplicable if they do not signify the moral diffusion of the Church throughout the world.

b. The words of Jesus Himself are no less clear. He tells us that when He is raised upon the cross He will draw all things to Himself. He commands His apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, to instruct all nations, baptizing

them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all whatsoever He had commanded them. He sends them as His witnesses to Jerusalem, throughout Judea, Samaria, and to the extremities of the earth.

c. The apostles perfectly understood the design of their Master. Faithful to His command they preached the Gospel, first in Judea and Samaria, then they dispersed through the pagan nations; and St. Paul was soon able to write to the Romans that their faith had been announced throughout the universe. The apostles knew then that Jesus wished the Church to be Catholic, and that Catholicity was one of its essential characters, hence they inserted in their creed this article of their faith: "I believe in the holy *Catholic* Church."

The testimony of the Fathers on this point may be found in "Faith of Catholics," vol. i.

THIS CATHOLICITY IS A NOTE. In fact it offers us a ready means of recognizing the true Church. It is not difficult to demonstrate which among the various Christian communions is the Church that can be said to be morally diffused throughout the world since the adequate promulgation of the Gospel, and to include in her bosom the greatest number of members professing the same faith by participation in the same sacraments and the same worship under the guidance of one and the same apostolic and pastoral ministry.

REMARKS.—1st. Strictly speaking, another Christian communion might at a given period exist simultaneously in different parts of the earth, and yet we must be able at every period to distinguish the legitimate communion from the illegitimate. Catholicity, therefore, to be a distinctive mark must have still another character or note; that is, the true Church must *always* outnumber every other Christian communion. At the same time, as Catholicity is *essential* to the Church, it is sufficient to prove that *at a given period*, at the present day, for example, such a Christian society is the

most widely spread and the most numerous: we are then authorized to conclude that it is this society which has been universally diffused and the most numerous *at all times* since the promulgation of the Gospel.

2d. We must not forget that by the notes of the Church, especially its Catholicity, we must distinguish the true Christian *Church* from other Christian societies. The divinity of the Christian *religion* has been shown in the first part of the book (Ch. III.) by other characteristic marks.

D. *Apostolicity.*

In saying that the true Church is necessarily apostolic, we mean that she must profess the doctrine taught by the apostles: this is apostolicity of doctrine; then, that she must be able to trace her descent from the apostles through the succession of her lawful heads: this is apostolicity of ministry or government. Apostolicity of doctrine is the logical and indispensable consequence of the unity required in the true Church. The necessity of this characteristic is rarely disputed, but it is of little service as a note, as a positive means of discerning the true Church. Hence we shall dwell more particularly on the apostolicity of ministry. We have shown above, pp. 303 f., 318 f., that all authority in the Church has been really bestowed upon the apostles. This authority must, as we shall prove, pass to their successors.

Thesis.—Jesus Christ Willed that the Powers Given to His Apostles should be Transmitted to all their Successors.

First Argument.—*a.* Jesus imposed upon Peter, and then upon all the apostles, the exercise of the ministry which His Father had confided to Him for the purpose of saving all men till the end of time. Hence this ministry is *essential* to the Church, and must be *indefectible* and *perpetual.* There must *always,* until the end of the world, be men who exercise it in the name of Jesus Christ; there must also *always* be a foun-

dation which supports the edifice, *always* one in whom is deposited the power of the keys, *always* a supreme pastor to feed the entire flock, *always* heads associated with him for preaching the word and for governing the Church. This foundation, this depositary, this supreme pastor, these subordinate heads cannot be Peter and the apostles in their individual persons alone, since they are mortal; they must be also Peter and the apostles in the *persons of their successors*. Now, because they only, and no others, have received their character and their power from Jesus Christ, they, and they only, can and must transmit this character and this power to whomsoever they choose; and those chosen can and must, in turn, transmit these prerogatives to others until the end of the world.

b. Christ assures us that His Church will *last* to the end of the world. But no society can exist for any length of time without an authority which is its very foundation. Such an authority must, therefore, be forever perpetual in the Church. Hence Christ willed that the ministry or authority given to the apostles should forever pass to their lawful successors in office, being with them but one moral person. He made no other provision for the continuance of the ministry in the Church.

c. The true Church of Christ must ever, until the end of time, be distinguishable from heterodox churches; she must ever, *until the end of time*, be able to prove her descent from the apostles by the uninterrupted succession of her pastors.

Second Argument. — We see from the *history of the apostles* that they did indeed transmit to others the powers which they had received from Jesus Christ, by appointing bishops everywhere to replace and succeed them. Thus St. Paul made Timothy bishop of Ephesus, and Titus bishop of Crete, charging them to perpetuate their ministry by appointing other pastors (Tit. i. 5).

Third Argument.—*Tradition* furnishes a most decisive proof for our thesis. But we must refer the reader to special

treatises on the subject. (See "Faith of Catholics," vol. i.)

REMARKS.—1st. The ministry confided by Jesus Christ to the apostles, and by the apostles to the bishops, their successors, includes a twofold power, the power of order and the power of jurisdiction.

a. Power of order regards the administration of the sacraments. Bishops alone possess it in all its fulness. Hence there is no priestly office which they cannot exercise; and they alone can confer upon others the sacred character which they have received. This character is conferred by sacramental ordination according to the fixed rite, which dates from the time of the apostles. Every validly consecrated bishop has the power of ordaining other bishops. Even should he fall into heresy or schism, the consecration or ordination performed by him would still be valid though not lawful, provided he observed the prescribed rite. The power of order is *inamissible*, i.e., once obtained it can never be lost.

b. The power of jurisdiction includes at the same time the faculty of lawfully exercising the power of order and the right of taking part in the government of the Church. This faculty and this right are conferred by *canonical institution*, and depend on the will of the supreme head of the Church. No bishop who has not received jurisdiction from the head of the Church can *lawfully* ordain a priest or consecrate a bishop, even though he do it *validly;* nor can he take part, *even validly*, in the administration and government of the Church. To be in the legitimate and full line of succession of the pastors of the Church, that is, in the hierarchy of jurisdiction, it does not suffice that a bishop have received the power of order; he must also have the power of jurisdiction. In other words, it is not sufficient that he be consecrated bishop; he must also have received with his consecration the right of administering a diocese, which in virtue of the apostolic succession becomes thus attached to one of the primitive apostolic sees. This is a self-evident proposition which may be proved by the words of all the Fathers, who condemn

as schismatics, bishops in possession of usurped sees. The episcopacy is established for the administration of the Church, and a bishop is a chief or ruler in the Church. Hence he must have subjects. But one cannot give himself subjects; Jesus alone, who has received from His Father the nations as a heritage, could confide to whom He pleased the power to govern the faithful, that is, the *power of jurisdiction.* He confided it, as we have seen, to the apostles, and chiefly to Peter, their head, with power to transmit it. Hence a Christian society whose bishops go back to the apostles only through the power of order, and not also through the power of jurisdiction, cannot claim to be apostolic, and consequently cannot be the Church of Christ.

c. It belongs to the heads of the Church to transmit this power of jurisdiction and to determine the mode of transmission left undetermined by Christ. This mode may have varied in the course of time, particularly in regard to the selection of subjects who are to receive this jurisdiction. Without prejudice, however, to the vicar of Christ's essential right of free nomination in regard to all dignities and offices outside his own, subjects have been chosen, sometimes by election, sometimes by presentation, sometimes by the will alone of the successors of St. Peter.

As the canonical rules observed in this transmission were established by the Church, and not by Jesus Christ, the Church has a right to modify them according to circumstances. But the jurisdiction itself always resides in the heads of the Church, and is always transmitted by canonical laws in force at the time. Consequently whosoever has not received jurisdiction according to these rules does not possess it, and though he may have received episcopal consecration he does not belong to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Having neither see nor subjects, it is evident that he cannot be one of the *heads* of the Church, and has no claim to *apostolic succession.*[1]

[1] A. C. Q. xx. 225 (Order and Jurisdiction).

2d. Bishops have the same functions and the same powers as the apostles. There are, however, certain personal privileges which the apostles as founders, after Christ, of the Church alone enjoyed, and which they did not transmit to their successors; such are: infallibility in teaching the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the right to preach the Gospel throughout the world and to govern the faithful, and the right to erect bishoprics by their own authority.

These two powers of order and jurisdiction are communicated to priests, but in a limited degree and in view of certain acts only; for example, the administration of sacramental absolution.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH OF ROME POSSESSES THE FOUR POSITIVE NOTES OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

I. The Church of Rome Possesses Unity.[1]

A. The Church is One in Doctrine.—Throughout the whole world we find the children of the Church chanting and professing the same creed, accepting the same precepts, the same sacrifice, the same sacraments. And if we go back to apostolic times we find the same identity of doctrine.

The Church, moreover, possesses a principle which necessarily sustains unity of belief: she professes as an essential dogma that all must accept every doctrine which she proclaims to be of faith, under pain, if they persist in error, of being ejected from her bosom.[2]

Remark.—It can never be proved that the Church of Rome has ever ceased to teach a single dogma contained in the apostolic writings, or that she has ever admitted a point of doctrine contrary to these writings. Never has she defined a truth without previously demonstrating that the

[1] Rhodes; Preston; Harper, I., essay 1; Newman, Difficulty of Anglicans, l. 10, 11; D. R. New Ser. xv. 458; C. W. lix. 152.

[2] Lacordaire, conf. 29, 30, Cath. Doctr. and Society.

apostles taught it either in writing or by word of mouth. The Council of Nice, for example, did not create the dogma of the divinity of Jesus Christ when, in refutation of the Arian heresy, it defined the consubstantiality of the Word, any more than the Council of Trent created the dogma of transubstantiation when it defined the Eucharist, in refutation of the Protestant doctrine of the Eucharist. On the contrary, it was only because these dogmas were always believed in the Church that the Councils could define them. Thus in our own day the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff have been declared articles of the Catholic faith. But they are not new articles added to its doctrine, they are simply *ulterior developments* of the doctrine revealed by Jesus Christ, and taught from the beginning of the Church; they are truths implicitly contained in the deposit of revelation, which were brought forward more prominently to confound the adversaries of the ancient faith and preserve the people from a pernicious error.[1]

[1] If dogma is immutable, like truth itself, this immutability does not exclude progress. Progress in the Church is only the development of principles laid down by Jesus Christ. Thus, for example, the Church has declared or defined in three successive Councils that there are in Jesus Christ one person, two natures, and two wills. These three definitions are only logical developments of one and the same truth, which, under its primitive, its revealed form, was known and taught at all times: Jesus Christ is at the same time true God and true man.

The following remarks will illustrate still more clearly the manner in which doctrine is developed in the Church.

1st. There are in revelation a certain number of points which, in the first days of Christianity, were formally and explicitly presented to the belief of the faithful.

2d. There are others which in the beginning were not explicitly given, and were destined, in the plan of divine Providence, to be developed gradually in the course of time and under the direction of authority.

3d. The history of the latter contains three different periods or epochs. In the first period they are not immediately obvious, either

B. THE CHURCH OF ROME IS ONE IN HER MINISTRY.—There is nothing more palpable or more readily recognized. Unity of faith, which we have just demonstrated, is maintained in the Church by a unique, invariable, and perfectly known ministry. The gentle but firm action of this ministry has its source at Rome, the centre of government, whence it is conveyed by means of bishops and subordinate pastors to all parts of the world until it reaches the humblest members of the Church. The simple faithful are united to their immediate pastors, the latter are united to their bishops, the bishops are united with the Pope, from which they hold their faculties. Thus is the most complicated multiplicity reduced to the most marvellous unity. Here again is a principle which sustains this unity: he who refuses to submit to the authority of the lawful pastors of the Church is excluded from her bosom.

History testifies that this unity, which we admire at the present day, has remained unbroken through all the Christian centuries. *Disciplinary laws* may vary with circumstances, for they are not a divine but an ecclesiastical institution:

because of their deep metaphysical character, which caused their connection with the principles revealed to remain unobserved, or because of circumstances which do not permit institutions to manifest themselves completely in the first days of their existence, or simply because of the actual impossibility of the human mind to think of everything at the same time.

In the second period these truths, which lay dormant in the Christian conscience, began to be agitated; they made more impression than heretofore; they were preached and were presented as new food of piety to the faithful. Then it happened that certain persons contested them, alleged the obscurity of the tradition upon which they rested. and protested against their being considered as part of revelation.

In the third period authority established them as articles of faith, and decided that they were originally contained in revelation. (Card. Franzelin.) *

* Newman on Development; D. R. New Ser. xii. 28, Apr. 1901; Humphrey, Written Word, ch. 11; Br. W. xiv. 1; Garside, p. 153 ff.; Schanz, III., ch. 1; C. W. lxxii.; *J. E. R.*, July 1901.

the authority which has established them has a right to abolish or modify them; in fact it must needs vary them according to the exigencies of the times. But the hierarchy, the ministry for the governing and the teaching of the faithful, is a divine institution. It comes from Jesus Christ, and consequently never varies. Let us observe in passing that the *worship and ceremonial* also may, for analogous reasons, undergo certain modifications in rites or accessory ceremonies, but it remains in all places and at all times the same in everything essential established by Christ.

Objection.—At the period of the great schism of the West, from 1378 to 1417, there were two Popes reigning at the same time, Urban VI. at Rome, Clement VII. at Avignon. Among Christian nations some gave their allegiance to Urban, others to Clement. Did not this destroy for nearly half a century the Church's unity of ministry or government? [1]

Reply.—It is true that during this time the *material* union of government was disturbed in the Church, but formal or *essential* unity never ceased to exist. There were not two legitimate popes any more than there are at the present day; but various circumstances made it difficult to discern clearly the veritable supreme head of the Church and caused a deplorable division. The situation, which Catholics acknowledged was contrary to the will of God, was a source of great grief to them. Both sides sought the truth and never desisted until every doubt was dissipated, and the entire Church acknowledged Martin V., elected in 1417 by the Council of Constance.

Hence this schism, which is easily explained by an error in a question of facts, in no way weakens our thesis; it proves, on the contrary, the profound spirit of unity which animated the members of the entire Church. No one admitted the simultaneous existence of two lawful heads; all were convinced

[1] Dr. Brann; Rhodes; Preston (Ch. Unity); Spalding, J. M., Miscellanies, ch. 9; A. C. Q. xvi. 67; M. lxxviii. 77, 194; Br. W. vii. 320; Murphy, ch. 20; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 36, 39.

that there was, and that there could be, but one; but who this one head was remained for a time doubtful. Evidently one part of Christianity erred in their choice; but they erred in good faith, and the obedience of both sides was conscientiously given.

II. The Church of Rome Possesses Sanctity.[1]

The Church of Rome is holy in her final *end*, which is the sanctification and the salvation of the faithful. She is holy in the *means* she employs; in her *dogmas* which are attacked only because of their sublimity and because many of them transcend, as to their essence, the limit of human reason; in her *moral teaching*, to which even her adversaries pay homage, which proscribes all vices, inculcates all virtues, and culminates in the perfection of the evangelical counsels;[2] in her *sacraments*, fruitful sources of grace and holiness; in her *worship*, the most spiritual which ever existed, the purest and freest from immoral or superstitious practices.[3] She is holy, finally, in the *members* who faithfully follow her precepts; only those who refuse to conform to her teaching, and thus incur her condemnation, fail to witness to her sanctity.[4]

[1] Thébaud, The Church and the Moral World; Digby, Mores Catholici; Ricards, Catholic Christianity, ch. 3 ff.; Lacordaire, conf. 21, 29, on Cath. Doctr and the Soul, A. C. Q. v. 385, ix. 166, xix. 813; C. W. vii., ix. 529; Br. W. vi. 409.

[2] On charges of immoral doctrines and practices see below, ch. 4, p. 520. The Church is holy in her *legislation;* because its whole object is to insure and facilitate (*a*) the success of her apostolic mission; (*b*) the faithful observance of the divine law; (*c*) the attainment of higher Christian perfection.—Editor.

[3] Bridgett; Chateaubriand, Genius, etc.; Wiseman, Essays, vol. ii.; Ricards, l. c., ch. 7; J. L. Spalding, Lectures, l. 7; Chatard, Christian Truths, l. 8; Lockhart, l. c., ch. 7 ff.; Shadler, Beauties of the Catholic Church; Br. W. vi. 380, viii. 117; A. C. Q. xi. 462; D. R. Old Ser. ix. 2, xxxv. 362, xliii. 391; C. W. iv. 721, xv. 605, xix. 322, xliii. 250.

[4] Bowden, The Witness of the Saints; Burnet, Path, ch. 10; Allies,

It would be difficult to enumerate the legions of holy children which the Church of Rome has borne. Without mentioning Christian heroes of the first ages, where shall we find outside the Church any that can be compared to men like St. Benedict, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Dominic, St. Francis de Sales, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xavier, St Vincent of Paul, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Teresa, and innumerable others? In addition to these saints of all ages placed upon her altars, who professed no other faith than that of the Church of Rome and whom she alone can claim, she has nourished in her bosom innumerable souls of no less solid virtue, whose sanctity, though hidden from the eyes of the world, equalled that of the canonized saints. And in our own day, in the midst of the corruption of the world, as many good works and deeds of virtue are performed under the influence of the same quickening spirit as in the preceding centuries.[1] God has been pleased to proclaim at all times the eminent sanctity of the heroes of the Church by the most striking miracles—miracles which can be attributed only to divine intervention, and which are confirmed by such irrefutable testimony that to question them is to annihilate history and refuse the testimony of reason.

For many centuries the examination of miracles has been reserved to the Pope. We find in the capitularies of Charlemagne a prohibition against publishing any miracle before the sovereign Pontiff has pronounced upon it. It is well known how carefully and severely miracles in cases of canonization are tested by the Congregation of Rites under the guidance of the supreme Pontiff.[2] And yet how many

The Monastic Life; Br. W. viii. 219; Scheeben, Sanctity of the Ch. in the XIX. Cent'y.

[1] C. W. li. 533; also Oratorian Lives of Modern Saints.

[2] Faber, W., Essay on Beatificat on and Canonization; D. R. New Ser. xxvi 1; Benedict XIV. on Heroic Virtue (first vol. of Oratorian Lives); Burnet Path, ch. 6; J. M. Spalding, Evid., l. 5; Baart, The Roman Court, ch. 5.

miracles have been authentically proved in the last centuries! For example, those of St. Francis Xavier, St. John de Cupertino, St. Philip Neri, St. Francis de Sales. The severe and learned Pope Benedict XIV., in the appendix to his great work on the canonization of the saints, relates the most striking miracles, among others those of St. Elizabeth of Portugal, St. Pius V., St. Andrew of Avellino, St. Felix of Cantalicio, St. Catharine of Bologna, etc. The work of the Bollandists, that gigantic monument to the glory of the saints, gives abundant proof of the continuity of this divine testimony in favor of the Catholic Church. We have already stated above the reason why miracles are not as numerous at the present day as in the first ages of the Church. We must bear in mind, moreover, that the miracles of the early ages, being supported by incontestable testimony, are quite as conclusive for us. They proclaim to-day, as they did then, the holiness of the Church in favor of which they were wrought; they demonstrate that God gives the most manifest approval to the virtues practised in her bosom. Finally, the Church's remarkable preservation and the marvellous results which she continually produces in the world are true miracles and become more and more striking as her age increases.

Our own century has not lacked the testimony of divine miracles The most exacting critic has only to read the life of the venerable Curé of Ars and writers on Lourdes[1] to recognize that the power of God still abides with His true children.

[1] Dr. Lasserre and Clarke, S.J., on Lourdes; Dr. Lefevre and Card. Walsh on Louise Lateau; the articles in C. W. xiii. 1, xxxix. 835, on the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, liv. 897, on Lourdes, xiv. 171, on Louise Lateau; also D. R. New Ser. xvii. 170; Irish Eccl. Record, Aug. 1900, "Modern Miracles"; Searle, Plain Facts, ch. 21; Parsons, Studies, VI., n. 22.

III. The Church of Rome Possesses Catholicity.

The Church of Rome is Catholic at all times and in all places:[1] this is so manifest that she alone has always been designated by this glorious title, and no dissenting communion has ever dared to assume it.[2] As early as the time of St. Augustine, the name Catholic designated exclusively the members of the Church of Rome, and at all times we have proclaimed Christian our name, Catholic our surname.[3]

After she took possession of the world through the eight thousand men of every tongue and every nation converted by St. Peter, the Church never ceased to spread and to win new subjects.[4] This we have already seen from our reflections on the rapid propagation of the Gospel throughout the world. At the end of the first century the Church had gone beyond the limits of the Roman empire, and since that time her ascendency over barbarism continually increased, recovering in one country what she lost in another, and ever finding reproduced in some part of the world the marvellous fruitfulness of her youth.

This marvellous universality is as strikingly manifested at the present day. Let us pass in review the most distant countries, the most obscure islands of the ocean, and we shall find Catholics everywhere, and we shall find not only that

[1] Lacordaire, conf. 31, Cath Doctr. and Society.

[2] It is only of late years that Protestants have endeavored to claim this title by establishing the fallacious distinction of *Catholic* and *Roman* Catholic. But, as the author of "Catholic Belief" observes, "the word *Roman* does not limit the word Catholic, but completes it, declaring more expressly that which is already supposed in the word Catholic, viz., that the Catholic Church has its centre in Rome." —Translator.

[3] Capel, Catholic, etc.; Austin, Notes on the Catholic Name; C. W. i. 96, 669, 741; Spalding, Evid., l. 4; A. E. R., Sept. 1902, Febr. 1903.

[4] Marshall, Cath. Missions; Wiseman, Lectures on Doctrines of the Church, ll. 6, 7; D. R. III. Ser. xii., xiii., xvii, xxi.; Spalding, Evidences, l. 4. See also above, p. 217 ff.

the Catholic Church is spread throughout all countries of the earth, but that she far exceeds in numbers each of the other Christian societies.[1]

IV. The Church of Rome Possesses Apostolicity.

A. The Doctrine of the Church of Rome Goes back to the Time of the Apostles.—Her doctrine of to-day is the same as that of the apostles. In speaking of the unity of doctrine in the Church we demonstrated a complete identity between the oldest creeds or professions of faith, the writings and decisions of the first ages and those of our time.

Protestants claim, it is true, that after the first centuries the Church of Rome created new dogmas; for example, that of the real presence, purgatory, and the invocation of the saints. We have replied to this objection (p. 332). Moreover, such a statement is worthless unless proved. It is necessary to show when and how these dogmas were introduced into the Church; this our opponents have never done, and for a good reason. Meanwhile what is stated without proof the Church has a right to deny without proof, for she is in possession. She does not, however, lack proof: she has history to testify how zealously in the first ages popes and bishops opposed all doctrinal innovations. Hence they would have offered the same opposition to the introduction of the important dogmas contested by Protestants. They did not do so, for ecclesiastical history, so watchful in matters of this kind, is silent on this point. Perhaps it will be said that all the members of the Church, pastors and flocks in all parts of the world, agreed to admit without protest such numerous and grave innovations. In the first place, this hypothesis is absurd; in the second, the heretics of that period would not have failed to make themselves heard: condemned as innovators by the Church, they would have seized the opportunity to reproach her with her own innovations.

[1] Lacordaire, conf. 1 and 31 on the Church.

Remark on Tradition.—In the language of theology tradition is the attestation of a fact, a dogma, a custom, not formally contained in the Holy Scriptures If the attestation, made first by word of mouth, has been afterward consigned to the works of the Fathers or other historic documents which witness to their existence, it is called written tradition; otherwise it is oral tradition. Tradition of which we treat here, and which has its very source in the apostles themselves, is properly called *apostolic* tradition. But inasmuch as in matters of faith and morals they can have taught only what they received from the very mouth of Jesus Christ or by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it is also called with reason *divine* tradition.[1]

Taken in this last sense the name tradition is applied by theologians sometimes to a collection of truths and precepts communicated first verbally by the apostles: thus we say the deposit of apostolic tradition; sometimes to the fact itself of the uninterrupted transmission of these truths or precepts: thus we say such a point of dogma or morals is established by tradition; sometimes, finally, in a complex manner, to these same truths and precepts as transmitted from age to age, from the apostles to us: this is the sense in which we employ it here.[2]

[1] Humphrey, Written Word, ch. 7, 8; Card. Manning Grounds of Faith; A. C. Q. xii. 409; Walworth ch. 11; Wiseman, lect. 1–7; Hunter, I., tr. 2, ch. 1.

[2] "If there is a book," says the learned Le Hir, "to which the key is found in tradition alone, it is the Bible. But here philological tradition is not enough if it be not intimately allied with dogmatic tradition. I would like you to understand how very imperfect, defective, erroneous, and often bizarre is a science of the past that is cut loose from the great tree of tradition The last Phœnician workman, if he came back to us, could teach our greatest experts in the deciphering and interpretation of the texts of his country. In the midst of life, where he once moved, and in the daily exchange of ideas and reports forming a living tradition, he would find advantages and resources which the most profound researches could only imperfectly supply." See also Didon, J. Ch., introd. pp. xxxiv. and xliv.

Among the truths attested by tradition alone, and which are not explicitly taught in Holy Scripture, let us cite as examples the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin and the validity of baptism administered by heretics with the requisite form and matter.

There are three principal organs of tradition, that is, three means by which we may go back without fear of error to the apostolic source; they are the universal and constant belief of the Church, the sacred liturgy, and the ancient historic monuments, particularly the writings of the Fathers.[1]

We shall not dwell any further on tradition, though it is of very great importance for the knowledge of *revealed truth;* here we have to establish the *foundations* of faith and to furnish proofs of the divine origin of the Church. Now to attain this end tradition, from a *theological* point of view as an infallible source of doctrine, does not offer many advantages. When we have recourse to it, it will be as to a *historic* testimony of incontestable value.[2]

B. The Ministry of the Church Goes Back to the Time of the Apostles through the Uninterrupted Succession of her Chief Pastors.—All history testifies to the fact that the sovereign pontiffs have come down in uninterrupted succession from Peter to Leo XIII. The popes have always proclaimed themselves before the world the successors of the chief of the apostles and the inheritors of his supreme authority. The churches in subjection to the Church

[1] We call Fathers of the Church distinguished pastors and Doctors who, particularly in the first centuries after the time of the apostles, adorned the Church by their learning, their doctrine, and their virtue. The name of Doctor is specially given those among them possessed of greater learning and authority. Such, in the Greek Church, were St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom; in the Latin Church, St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Leo, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bernard, and in later times St. Francis de Sales and St. Alphonsus Liguori.*

[2] Lacordaire, conf. 9 on the Church.

*Harper, I., p. 250 ff.; Hunter, I., n. 98.

at Rome and forming one with her show a like series of lawful pastors who hold their mission from the Apostolic See.

Objection.—The legitimate succession of Roman Pontiffs was interrupted several times by schisms and by the long sojourn of the popes at Avignon.[1]

Reply.—These facts in no way interrupt the legitimate succession of the supreme heads of the Catholic Church.

1st. During the schisms there was always but one legitimate pope, even though his authority may have been contested in good or bad faith by a part of the Church. If a province revolts against a prince, does he cease to be the lawful sovereign of this province which rightly or mistakenly disputes his authority? As to the great schism of the West which presents the greatest difficulties, we have dwelt sufficiently upon it (p. 334).

2d. The sojourn of the popes at Avignon did not prevent their being bishops of Rome and, as such, heads of the entire Church: a prince who lives outside the capital of his government does not forfeit the sovereignty of his country.

Conclusion of Article II.

The Catholic Church possesses, then, all the notes of the true Church; and as only one Church was founded by Christ, this Church must be the Church of Rome, whose mission is to lead man to eternal salvation. After the preceding demonstration the two articles following may seem useless. We would add them, however, as superabundant proofs so that they may facilitate the return of erring brethren to the fold of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and who earnestly desires that there be but one Fold and one Shepherd.

[1] On the fable of Popess Joan see Döllinger, Fables, etc.; Parsons, II., ch. 3; Alzog, II., § 185.

ART. III.—PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE NOTES OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.[1]

There is really but one serious heresy at the present day, Protestantism. Under this generic name we include all who, accepting revelation, protest against the authority of the Catholic Church and claim that Scripture is the only source of revealed truth. Protestantism, in fact, is not a definite religion. The innumerable sects which it includes have no other bond of communion than the same negative name which belongs alike to all heresy, no other principle of life than the dogmas and precepts which they have preserved from the Catholic Church from which they separated.

HISTORICAL NOTICE.—Let us say a few words of the first authors of Protestantism.[2] MARTIN LUTHER was born at Eisleben in Saxony in 1483. He embraced the religious life in the Augustinian convent of Erfurt and was sent by his superiors to the University of Wittenberg, where he taught theology. He was particularly remarkable here for his love of novelties and his indomitable pride. In 1517 Leo X. intrusted the preaching of certain indulgences to the Dominicans. The preference shown another order probably offended Luther, who was of a lively imagination and passionate nature. He began by violently attacking what he called the preachers' abuses and exaggeration in language, and was soon led into attacking the doctrine

[1] In this and the following article consult the corresponding references given in the preceding articles of this chapter.

[2] On *Luther* see Anderdon; Audin; Döllinger; Stang; Verres; Murphy, ch. 22; Parsons, Studies, III., ch. 18; A C. Q. viii. 689, ix. 551; D. R. Old Ser. xxxix. 1; M. xlix. 305–457. On *Calvin* see Parsons, l. c., ch. 21; C. W. xxxvii 769; D. R. Old Ser. xxix. 30; De Trevern, l. 2, app. 2. On *Wyclif* see Stevenson, S.J.; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 41; D. R. Old Ser. xxxv. 382. On *Wesley* see D. R. New Ser. xxiii. 87. On *Henry VIII.* see Gasquet, O.S.B. (also M., July '82 ff.), and Kenrick, Vindication. On *Knox* see Spalding, Hist. of Ref., II., pp. 228 and 489. On *Huss* see Spalding, Miscell., I., essay 10; Parsons, l. c.; III., ch. 1. In general see Works on Church History.

of indulgences itself and the right to grant them. Then, carried on by the consequences of a first false principle, he went from one error to another. From this time forward we find in his writings addressed to the people the principle which was to play so important a rôle in his doctrinal system: faith alone obtains the remission of sin. After long and patient efforts on the part of Leo X. to win him back to truth and obedience, a bull of excommunication was issued against the rebellious monk. Far from submitting, the heresiarch consummated his rebellion by causing the bull to be burned publicly at Wittenberg, and Protestantism found its first apostle. Eight years later he married an ex-nun called Catherine Bora. He died in 1546.

Unbridled love of false liberty, covetous desire for ecclesiastical spoils, a moral teaching which gave free rein to the passions, the abolition of ecclesiastical celibacy, the unheard-of violence exercised toward those who desired to remain faithful to the faith of their fathers, together with other causes, secured him a large number of followers.

Shortly after Luther, Zwinglius began to dogmatize in Switzerland, and Calvin in Geneva. Their doctrines are far from being in accord with those of Luther, but they all agree in contradicting the teaching of the Catholic Church, and according great freedom to the passions. As to Henry VIII., King of England, we know how, after writing against Luther and obtaining the title of "Defender of the Faith," he led his people into schism. He sought from the Pope authority to gratify his uncontrolled passions. As the Pope refused to second his criminal desires by sanctioning his divorce from Catherine of Aragon, his faithful wife, he abandoned the Church of Rome and had himself proclaimed head of the Anglican Church (1534). Heresy was soon grafted upon schism.

We have no need to insist further on these well-known facts, but let us demonstrate that Protestantism has none of the positive notes of the true Church of Christ

I. Protestantism is Absolutely Devoid of Unity.

A. It Lacks Unity of Doctrine.—*a.* There was no agreement whatever in matters of doctrine among the first founders of Protestantism, and their doctrinal divergences became more and more marked. In fact they have increased to such a degree that it is almost true to say that the diversity of principles in the Church equals that of individuals. Luther himself acknowledged this in 1525. "There are," he wrote, "almost as many sects and beliefs as there are individuals. One will not admit baptism; another rejects the Sacrament of the Altar; this one places another world between this present world and the day of judgment; that one teaches that Christ is not God. There is no one, however ignorant, who may not claim to be inspired by the Holy Spirit and give forth his imaginings and his dreams as prophecies." With time the diversity has become only more wide-spread. The number of sects existing in complete independence one of another can no longer be estimated. According to the official reports there are at present in the United States fifty-six principal sects, which with the secondary sects make two hundred and twenty-eight. In the city and suburbs of London alone there are more than one hundred different sects, and in each sect the various professions of faith succeed one another like leaves on the trees. Thus a Protestant minister of Kiel, Harms, did not hesitate to say that he could undertake to write on his thumb-nail all the doctrines uniformly accepted by his brethren.

b. Not only were the leaders of the Reformation far from agreeing in their religious tenets, but each one changed his religious opinions without the slightest difficulty, alternately accepting and rejecting points of doctrine according to the needs of the moment. Luther went so far as more than once to threaten his followers to retract all his innovations if they persisted in annoying him and creating difficulties.

According to Melanchthon himself, the most moderate of all the apostles of the Reformation, "the articles of faith should be frequently changed and should be based upon the character of the times and circumstances."

c. This variation in the belief of the early reformers and of their followers of the present day need not astonish us; it is a necessary consequence of the Protestant *rule of faith.* In fact Protestants reject the Catholic principle of the authority of the Church divinely charged to interpret infallibly Holy Scripture and tradition. They claim that the Bible alone, interpreted according to the reason of the individual, teaches each one what he is to believe. It is not difficult to see whither this dissolvent principle may lead.[1] Thus it furnished Bossuet in the century immediately following the Reformation matter for his masterpiece, the "History of the Variations of the Protestant Church."

Remark.—Despite this so-called rule of faith, the majority of Protestants obey in reality any minister who has the address to make himself heard and to secure the suffrage of a certain number. But such authority, besides being purely human, as well as contrary to the fundamental principle of their rule of faith, can hardly fail to produce diversity of beliefs. Why should there be more conformity among the teachers than among their flocks?

d. Worship being only an *expression of faith,* and diversity of belief entailing necessarily diversity of rites and religious ceremonies, it must introduce in Protestantism great variety of practices in regard to sacraments, sacrifices, and prayers. Thus some admit and others reject the same sacrament; and among those who admit it some accept it in one sense, others in another. Luther, for example, reduced the number of sacraments from seven to two. Again, according to the Lutheran doctrine, baptism is not regenerating, it does not produce interior sanctification; again, justification does not mean that sin is really effaced; it means that it is not *imputed*

[1] See Lacordaire, conf. 27, Cath. Doct.

to man, that it is covered by faith in the merits of Jesus Christ. As to the Eucharist, some acknowledge the real presence of Jesus in the sacred Host, others regard it only as a figure. Luther, though forced by the clearness of the sacred text to admit this presence, nevertheless modified the Catholic dogma concerning it. He claimed that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are not present by the *conversion* of the elements of bread and wine, or by *transubstantiation*, but that they are present *under* and *with* the bread and the wine; that Christ is present only at the moment we receive the Eucharist; that the sacrament was instituted only to be received in communion, but not to be offered as a true exterior sacrifice. Nor do our opponents differ any less in the administration of the sacrament. Finally, some adore Christ as God, others refuse Him the homage of their worship; some pray for the dead, others condemn the practices.

e. Many Protestant churches, in order to preserve a shadow of unity, have had recourse to formulas of faith, creeds, or synodal decrees. Luther himself, in direct contradiction of his fundamental rule of faith, wrote a catechism; he even went farther and declared: "There is not an angel in heaven, still less a man upon earth, who may and who dares to judge my doctrine: whosoever will not adopt it cannot be saved; and whosoever believes not as I believe is destined for hell." There could hardly be a more formal contradiction of private interpretation. Many of his followers refused to accept either the formulas or decisions, justly observing that under such conditions they had better have remained in submission to the great and ancient authority of the Church of Rome. We see that this want of unity is an absolutely incurable evil among Protestants. There are Protestant sects, but there is not, there cannot be a Protestant Church, since they have no common faith, no unity of doctrine, nor any principle of such unity.

B. It Lacks Unity of Ministry or Government.—Each sect, by the fact that it possesses a belief of its own,

is independent of all the others, and the ministers of one have not the right to interfere in the ministry and government of another. What is more, in each determined communion the ministers are in reality independent of one another. It is, in fact, a Protestant principle that each one lawfully exercises his ministry if he does not diverge from the doctrine of the fundamental articles. But, again, who has the requisite authority to define these articles?

II. Protestantism does Not Possess Holiness.[1]

A. It is Not Holy in its Founders.—1st. History represents Luther as a man of violent temper, addicted to excesses of the table, and trampling under foot the most solemn engagements; Calvin as an impure, vindictive character; Zwinglius as a debauchee, as he himself acknowledges; Henry VIII. as an adulterer and a debauchee. The morals and private sentiments of Luther as revealed in his own writings will not bear publication.

2d. The reformers authorized the most revolting crimes in their followers. Luther, in servile deference to a crowned head, did not dare to preach against polygamy, and even went so far as to permit bigamy in the Landgrave Philip of Hesse; the permission was confirmed by seven other reformers, and Melanchthon assisted at the marriage.

3d. In their writings and conversation they show themselves men of ungoverned temper, corrupt heart, and indomitable pride. At the least resistance they broke forth into abusive and profane language. Luther's language, particularly, is at times most gross and revolting.[2]

[1] On the Fruits of Protestantism see Spalding, History of the Reformation, p. III., IV.; Evidences, l. 7; Spalding J. L., lect. 1; Marcy, ch. 23 ff.; A. C. Q. ix. 70 (Puritans), 127, xiv. 243; Br. W. v. 244, xiv. 447; C. W. xxxviii. 194 (in England); D. R. Old Ser. xiv. 379; III. Ser. xiv. (in Prussia).

[2] See Jansen, Verres, O'Connor, and Audin, also our remarks upon Protestant intolerance below in Ch. IV.

B. It is Not Holy in its Doctrine.—Protestantism has no common moral teaching binding upon all, any more than a common belief which all are obliged to accept. Its adherents claim that the Bible is the only rule of morals as well as belief, and as each one is allowed to interpret it according to the light of his reason there is nothing to prevent any one from fashioning his own moral teaching: he may even change his ethics according to the ever-varying disposition of his mind. That which his prejudice of to-day makes him read in the Scriptures may appear to him to-morrow in an entirely different light, and he is free to change his conduct according to his convictions.

Finally (it is hardly credible), a Protestant is not obliged to practise what he reads in the Scriptures, however clear it may be. For the founders of the Reformation teach that works are useless and even injurious to salvation; that faith suffices to make us the friends of God; that man once justified before God is sure of being saved, whatever crimes he may afterward commit. What is more, that it is even impossible for man to sin since he is not free. Luther and Calvin go so far as to deny the existence of free-will in man. Luther wrote a book called "Slave Will," which may be summed up thus: "God is the author of the evil as well as the good in us, and as He saves us without any merit on our part, He also damns us through no fault of ours. . . . All that we do is done, not freely, but through pure necessity." (Works of Luther, vol. ii., p. 435.) Calvin holds the same language. "God," he says, "for incomprehensible reasons excites men to violate His laws. His inspirations move the hearts of sinners to evil. Man falls because God has so ordered it." (Instit. Christ., bk. vii., ch. 23.) Again, "God," says Zwinglius, "is the first principle of sin. It is through a divine necessity that man commits all crimes." (De Provid. Ep., vol. i., p. 355.)

Let us give a few other texts from Luther, for they are more conclusive than argument. "How rich is the Christian!

Even if he would he could not be disinherited by sin: not to believe in the Son of God is the only sin in this world. Believe, therefore, and you are sure of your salvation." (Luther, "Captivity of Babylon.") "There is no more dangerous, more pernicious scandal than a good life exteriorly manifested by good works. Pious souls who do good to gain the kingdom of heaven not only will never reach it, but will be counted among the damned." (Works of Luther, vol. vi.) "The Gospel does not ask our works for our justification; on the contrary, it condemns these works." "Murder, theft are not sins so great as to wish to reach heaven through good works, which are the things most prejudicial to salvation." (Sermons inédits publiés par Mack.)

This same *inefficacy and uselessness of good works* is taught by Calvin in more than fifteen different parts of his "Institutes of the Christian Religion." Such a doctrine flows naturally from the idea those innovators had of justification or righteousness. Man is made just and righteous, they said, without any internal change in him; it all consists in the gratuitous and merely external imputation of the righteousness of Jesus Christ to the Christian. A sinner becomes a just man by the mere fact that God deigns to consider him covered as with a mantle by the holiness of His Son. The moral character of man's conduct does not enter at all into the conditions required for the friendship of God; sin amounts to nothing, provided faith remains firm and strong. "Be a sinner and sin stoutly," Luther wrote to his friend Melanchthon. . . . "We must needs sin as long as we are in this world; . . . sin cannot deprive us of God, even were we to commit in the same day a thousand adulteries and murders."[1] Such doctrine is evidently the destruction of the very principle

[1] Here is the Latin text: "Esto peccator et pecca fortiter, sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi. Peccandum est quamdiu hic sumus. Sufficit quod agnovimus per divitias Dei Agnum qui tollit peccata mundi: ab hoc non avellet nos peccatum, etiamsi millies et millies uno die fornicemur et occidamus." (Works, Jena, 1556, vol. i., p. 545.)

of morality. If it were true, Jesus Christ, instead of coming into the world to deliver us from sin and to teach us, by word and example, to practise all, even the most heroic virtues, would have died to leave us free to live with impunity in crime.

C. It is Not Holy in its Influence upon Morals.—We can readily divine whither a doctrine must lead which places Robespierre and St. Vincent of Paul on the same level. Why should man trouble himself to restrain his evil inclinations; why may he not give free rein to his passions? It is not astonishing, therefore, to find Calvin protesting only a few years after the inauguration of the quasi-reformation that "among the hundred evangelists hardly one could be found who had adopted the ministry from any other motive than to be able to abandon himself with greater liberty to all kinds of voluptuousness and incontinency." Luther himself was soon alarmed at the fruit of his teaching. "Our Germany," he says, "since she has seen the light of the Gospel almost seems to be possessed by the devil. . . . The fear of God has disappeared; it is a deluge of vice of all kinds. . . . They take the Gospel for a gastronomic doctrine which teaches one to get drunk and to eat to bursting. This is the actual opinion of all without distinction. . . . Who among us would have entered upon this ministry could we have foreseen the numerous calamities and scandals it would breed? Now that we have begun we must abide by the consequences." (Luther's Works, ed. Walch, vol. viii.) And again he says: "I admit that my doctrine has indeed given rise to scandals. I shall not deny that the new state of things frequently makes me tremble, particularly when my conscience reproaches me with having disturbed the ancient order of the Church, which was so tranquil, so peaceful under the papacy, and with having, by my doctrine, created discord and trouble."[1] (Works, vol. ii.) Such avowals, which we could multiply, and which are to be found in Janssen's

[1] See Lacordaire, conf. 23.

History of the German People, demonstrate whether God is with those who claimed to reform the Church of Rome. While the sects of the Reformation incurred from the first the severest censures and bitterest reproaches, the Fathers of the Council of Trent, assisted by the Holy Spirit, efficaciously remedied by wise and prudent rules the abuses which had gradually crept into ecclesiastical discipline.

III. Protestantism does Not Possess Catholicity.

It is only too evident that Protestantism is not universal either as regards time or place. It began only in the sixteenth century; and even in the countries where it has penetrated, though it bears a generic name, it is in reality divided into a multitude of sects completely independent of one another, separated even by specific names, and frequently bitter enemies, having no other bond than their common hatred of the Catholic Church. How can they form but one religion when they have not and cannot have a body of truths uniformly taught everywhere? Uniformity of belief, binding upon all, would, moreover, be a contradiction of their fundamental principle, private interpretation of the Bible. Not only does no fraction of Protestantism approximate in numbers to the Catholic Church, but the sum of all its adherents does not equal the number of the Catholic faithful.

IV. Protestantism does Not Possess Apostolicity.

A. It is Not Apostolic in its Doctrine.—This we have superabundantly proved. Where is the apostolic doctrine imposed as of faith upon all? The apostles evidently did not receive from Christ and transmit to their successors the varied and frequently contradictory opinions which divide Protestant sects.

B. Nor is it Apostolic in its Ministry.—How can the

founders of Protestantism hold their authority from the apostles, they who revolted against the successors of the apostles, and preached a doctrine opposed to that which had been believed for centuries? In truth, Luther, Calvin, and the other leaders of Protestantism, realizing the necessity of justifying their revolt, claimed to have received what they called their mission of reformation from the apostles. But the authority to alter or perfect a divine work must rest upon something more than an affirmation. Christ Himself felt obliged to give abundant proofs of His mission. The reformers should have furnished at least a few miracles to credit their mission to the people. Luther was deeply sensitive to the need of such proof, and sorely perplexed how to furnish it. Sometimes he said he held his mission from the magistrate of Wittenberg, sometimes from his dignity of doctor. In the space of twenty-four years he changed his opinion on this point fourteen times.

The truth is, no one has received or ever will receive such a mission. We have seen that the apostles received the mission to teach all men, to preserve all that Jesus Christ had confided to them; and St. Paul pronounced anathema against any one, were he an angel from heaven, who would teach any other doctrine than that of the apostles. Hence it is proved that it was on their own authority that those so-called reformers arrogated to themselves their alleged mission. And the Church has the right to say to them: "You are of yesterday; I know you not."

As to Anglicans, though their bishops possessed the power of order, which they do not, it is manifestly evident that they have not the power of jurisdiction.[1] We have seen (p. 329 f.) that jurisdiction is transmitted by the authority in whom

[1] On *Anglican Orders* see Leo XIII. on Anglican Orders; Estcourt; Breen; M., Sept. '94 ff.; Sydney Smith, S.J., Reasons for Rejecting Angl. Orders; Brandi, S.J., Last Word on Anglican Orders; Ryan; Galway, S.J.; Wiseman, Essays, v. iii. See also works on Continuity; also the interesting collection, The Church of Old England, 4 vols., C. T. S.

it is vested, and according to the canonical law in force at the time of the transmission. Now whom do Protestant pastors succeed? From whom and how have they received jurisdiction? Certainly not from Luther, or Calvin, or Henry VIII. Nor from their first bishops, who abandoned the Church of Rome to embrace the tenets of the Reformation. The latter, it is true, received jurisdiction from the Church of Rome; but Rome, after their defection, took away the subjects she had confided to them, having as much right to withdraw them as she had to give them.[1]

Conclusion.—Protestantism, therefore, possesses none of the characteristic notes with which Our Saviour marked His Church; the work of the innovators of the sixteenth century is not the work of Christ; it is not the edifice built by the divine Hand to shelter the elect during their passage through this world.

There is still an easier means of setting forth most clearly the falseness of Protestantism, namely, by showing that its *rule of faith* is absolutely untenable and contrary to the will of Christ. When this basis is overthrown the whole edifice of the Reformation crumbles of itself.

Another peremptory and at the same time easy argument showing the illegitimate birth and existence of Protestantism we shall find in the primacy bestowed by Christ on St. Peter (see below, Art. V.).

V. The Protestant Rule of Faith Differs from that of Christ.

The Bible, nothing but the Bible, freely interpreted by every one, such has been from the beginning and still is the Protestant rule of faith.

[1] It is well known that a few years ago certain Anglicans sought ordination and consecration at the hands of the Jansenist bishop of Utrecht in order to be able legitimately to ordain and consecrate others. C. W. xviii. 686, 838; D. R. Old Ser. xlv. 468; A. C. Q. On the schismatic Church of Utrecht see Parsons, IV., ch. 14.

We Catholics profess also the greatest respect for the *Holy Scriptures*, but we receive it from the hands of the Church, which, in virtue of her infallibility, guarantees its inspiration. Moreover, with the Scriptures we receive from the same hand with equal veneration *Tradition*, that is, the word of God not contained in the Sacred Scriptures. Finally, far from claiming, like Protestants, that every one has the right to determine the meaning of Scripture, far from declaring every man the judge and arbiter of his belief, we say that it belongs to the Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit, to fix the catalogue or canon of the Holy Scriptures, to determine the meaning of the sacred text and unerringly interpret tradition. In a word, the *Catholic Rule of Faith* is the teaching authority of the Church, her living and infallible voice and doctrine.

Thesis.—The Protestant Rule of Faith is Untenable.[1]

First Argument.—This rule of faith is contrary to the will of Christ, and condemned by Scripture itself.

a. Protestants, if faithful to their rule of faith, must prove to us by clear texts from Scripture that the apostles received from their divine Master the command to write the teachings which fell from His lips. Far from being able to do this, they find as we do, when they read the Bible, that Christ, after founding His Church upon Peter and the twelve apostles, did not say to them, Go distribute Bibles, but, "Go *teach* all nations, *preach* the kingdom of God to them; teach them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you; he that heareth you heareth Me."

b. Christ giving example in His own person preached, but

[1] On the Bible as the rule of faith see Wiseman, Lectures, vol. i.; Lockhart, l. c., ch. 4 ff.; Bp. Shield, The Bible against Prot.; Preston, Protestantism and the Bible; Humphrey, S.J., Bible and Belief; Written Word, ch. 3 ff.; Alnatt in C. T. S. v., xiii.; Kenrick, Vindication, l. 3, 4; Hunter, I., tr. 2, ch. 2; The Bible Question fairly tested (Baltimore); Br. W. v. 352, vi. 122, 165, 203, 275, vii., viii. 373, 418; D. R., Oct. '94, 313.

He wrote nothing. Nowhere do we find that He founded a religion to be taught by writing, still less that it was to be done exclusively by writing. "Christ," says St. John Chrysostom, "left no written instructions to His apostles; but instead of books He promised them the Holy Spirit, who would inspire them what they should say."

c. The apostles, to whom Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would recall all that He had taught them, did as their Master commanded them. It was by preaching that faith was propagated in the world. It was only occasionally that a few of the apostles committed their teachings to writing. The other apostles wrote nothing, and yet they converted whole nations. It was only at the end of the first century, about sixty-seven years after the death of Christ, that the books of the New Testament were completed; yet the faithful could not have been without a rule of faith during all these years. Moreover, the sacred writers constantly refer to a parallel oral teaching; they formally declare that they wrote only a very small portion of Our Saviour's teachings; and they exact the same respect for what they taught by word of mouth as for what they had written. (2 John v. 12.) "Stand fast, brethren," says St. Paul to the Thessalonians, who were already Christians, "and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 14). And to Timothy (2 Tim. ii. 2): "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others."

d. It is well known that we have no biblical authority, no authority but tradition, for example, for the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath, for the validity of baptism administered by heretics. If there be in the Church a certain and unchangeable rule, followed by all the Fathers, proclaimed by all Councils, and observed by all her Doctors, it is assuredly this: To follow most faithfully the command so often repeated by St. Paul: "O Timothy, that keep which is committed to thy trust" (1 Tim. vi. 20). Keep, as St.

Vincent of Lerins explains, not what you have discovered yourself, but what has been entrusted to you; not what you have yourself invented, but what has been handed to you by others; not what your own mind has told you, but what you have learned from your predecessors; not what you have established by your individual efforts, but what you have received from hand to hand, by a public and official tradition, whereof you are not the author, but a simple guardian.

Second Argument.—This rule of faith is condemned by the teaching of the history of the Church. According to the testimony of St. Irenæus, there were, even in his time, many barbarous nations who believed in Christ, though paper and ink were unknown among them. These countries did not have the Holy Scriptures, and yet the same saint attests that they preserved the faith pure and intact by means of tradition. Do we find anywhere in the history of later times that the baggage of the ministers of the Church consisted of books which they distributed before they preached? How, moreover, would this have been possible before the invention of printing, that is, during the fourteen centuries when copies of the Bible were few and very expensive? During this period the majority of the faithful had little means of instruction save the oral teaching of the ministers of the Church, and yet they were Christians.

From all that we have said it is evident that the Church was founded *without* the Bible, and that it existed *before* the Bible. The gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles, and the Apocalypse did not form the Christian communions or the Church, but they were addressed to these communions already formed. Thus St. Augustine had good reason to declare that he would not believe the Gospel except on the authority of the Catholic Church.[1]

Third Argument.—In any case, if the Bible freely interpreted by all were the only rule of faith, very large classes

[1] Alnatt, The Church and the Sects, I. Ser., l. 5.

even of the present day would be deprived of the means of salvation, for there is a large majority that cannot read, or whose laborious life leaves them no time to read. And yet, according to Protestant teaching, every one must verify for himself the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the true meaning of each verse, as well as the authenticity, integrity, and fidelity of the version in his hands. If God had given the Bible as a rule of faith, if He had, as Protestantism insists, made it a law for all Christians to read the Bible for themselves, He would have made the entrance to the Church, to eternal salvation, impossible for nearly all men, particularly for the poor. Now one of the special marks which Christ has given of His divine mission is that the poor shall have the Gospel preached to them, and He declares them His favorite children (Luke iv. 18; vii. 22).

FOURTH ARGUMENT.—*Without the authority of the Church* it is impossible to establish the full canon of Scripture and to offer to the faith of believers a clearly and positively defined body of doctrine. In fact Protestants, even the most learned among them, cannot be certain that the Bible is inspired, that is, that it contains the word of God, not simply that of man. Nor can they be certain what books form part of the Bible. The testimony of history, the agreement of manuscripts, criticism, furnish only a human authority, upon which it would be impossible to make an act of divine faith. Criticism, moreover, has led Protestants to cut off successively from the list of the sacred books nearly all the books of the Old and the New Testament; and many of them even deny that any part of the Scripture is inspired.[1]

[1] Protestants reproach the Catholic Church with not allowing all the faithful to read the Bible. But it was precisely because of the abuse which the Waldenses, Albigenses, and particularly Protestants made of the sacred text, more especially since the world has been flooded with false versions, that the Church was obliged, for the protection of her children, to make wise restrictions concerning the

CONCLUSION.—The following simple dilemma suffices to prove the falseness of Protestantism: During the first period of its existence either the Church of Christ was buried in error or it had preserved the integrity and purity of its doctrine. In the first case, the promises which guaranteed the stability and perpetuity of the Church were not fulfilled, consequently the Author of these promises was not God nor was He sent by God. Hence we have no need to concern ourselves with His work, still less with the work of Luther or Calvin. If, on the contrary, the Church of Christ remained pure in its doctrine, this Church was the Church of Rome or it was another. If it was another church, Protestantism ought to have allied itself with that other Christian society, which was the true Church. Now this it did not do. If this true Church was the Church of Rome, then Protestantism had no right or reason to separate from her, and in rebelling against her it proclaimed its own illegitimacy.

May our separated brethren remember that their ancestors were Catholics, and that in adopting the Catholic faith they are not changing to a new religion; they are only returning to the bosom of the Church which their fathers unfortunately abandoned three centuries ago.

reading of the Scriptures. These restrictions, it must be borne in mind, refer only to the Bible translated into the vernacular; even then it is not prohibited when the version is approved by the Apostolic See, or when it is published with notes from the Fathers or learned Catholic authors.*

* Besides the authors mentioned in note p. 355, see also Clarke, S.J., The Pope and the Bible; Br. W. vi. 212, 232, vii. 237; D. R. Old Ser. xxiii. 145; M. lxiv. 480, lxv. 1; C. W. lvii. 20, lviii. 587. On the Bible *before the Reformation* see Alnatt, Which is the True Church?, p. 38; * Buckingham, The Bible in the Middle Ages; * Maitland, Dark Ages; C. W. xxvii. 359; Murphy, ch. 30. On *English Catholic* versions see Gasquet, Pre-Reformation Bible; Card. Newman, Tracts, etc., n. 6; C. W. xii. 149; D. R. i. 367, ii. 475, iii. 428, July '94, p. 122. On *Protestant* versions see A. C. Q. iv. 123, 344, 521, v. 701.

ART. IV.—THE SCHISMATIC GREEK CHURCH DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

REMARKS.—1st. We have not to concern ourselves here with the various heretical sects—Nestorians, Jacobites, or Eutychians—which arose in the East, and which existed long before the Greek schism. It is too evident that these religious factions, the origin and authors of which are known to us; which were formally condemned in Ecumenical Councils; which, far from possessing unity of faith and communion, are enemies one of another; which are limited to certain countries and have no power of expansion, cannot be the true Church of Christ.

2d. We must beware of confounding the Schismatic Greek Church with the United Greek Church, which, though it has a special liturgy of its own and differs from us in matters of discipline, forms part of the Catholic Church. It is important to remark here that the Church has at all times authorized customs proper to certain nations for the celebration of the divine office and the administration of the sacraments, when these customs were not contrary to the dogmas of faith. Thus the General Council of Florence, in the memorable act publishing the solemn reunion of the two Churches, decreed that the customs of each one should be preserved unchanged. And Benedict XIV., following the example of several of his predecessors, severely prohibited changing from one rite to the other, and he demonstrated in his encyclical that Rome had always endeavored to preserve the Oriental rite intact and had forbidden the mingling of customs and the changing from one rite to the other. This was also the line of conduct pursued by Pius IX., and such also has been that of Leo XIII. Therefore we see how vain is the fear entertained on this point by Greek schismatics, jealous of preserving their ancient customs.

HISTORICAL NOTICE.—Under the generic name of Schismatic Greek Church are included the various religious factions,

issues of the great schism of the East begun in the ninth century by Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, but which was not really consummated until the eleventh century, thanks to the ambition of Michael Cerularius, one of his successors (1054).[1]

Before Constantine chose Byzantium for his new capital the episcopal see of that city was dependent upon the Metropolitan of Heraclea. But hardly had this city received from the great emperor the title of second Rome, eldest and cherished daughter of old Rome, than ambition awoke in the hearts of its bishops. Proud of the favor which they enjoyed at court, and abusing the Third Canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), which conferred upon the Bishop of Byzantium "the primacy of *honor* after the Bishop of Rome," they hastened to claim primacy of jurisdiction which had always belonged to the sovereign Pontiff, claiming that Constantinople ought to be as exalted and glorious in ecclesiastical affairs as in political. John the Faster (583) first assumed the title of ecumenical or universal patriarch, and preserved it despite the vigorous protestations and adjurations of Pelagius II. and St. Gregory the Great.

Let us remark here with Pope St. Leo, who as early as the fifth century had to protest against the usurpation by Byzantine prelates of the rights of the Church of Rome, that "the presence of the emperor may constitute a royal residence, but it does not create an apostolic see; divine things not being regulated after the manner of human affairs."[2]

[1] See Church Histories. On the *Greek* schism see also Murphy, ch. 8; Tondini, The Pope of Rome; Preston (Ch. Unity); Spalding, J. M., Miscell. xxxi.; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 4, 9; Allies, Per Crucem, I., p. 46; C. W. iii. 1, x. 758; D. R. Old Ser. xvii. 447, xxiii. 406, III. Ser. iv. 22; A. C. Q. xxvii. 675 ff. On *Nestorians* see D. R. Old Ser. xiv. 122. On the *Copts*, ib. xxviii. 314, New Ser. i. 33. On *Armenians*, D R. Old Ser. vii. 333; C. W. lx. 212. On *Maronites*, D. R. Old Ser. xviii. 43. On the *Abyssinians*, D. R. New Ser. i. 30. On the *Portuguese* Schism in India, D. R. Old Ser. xxvi. 179, Jan. '93, p. 27.

[2] The principle invoked by St. Leo is so obvious that even the

It is evident that if the contrary principle were ever admitted, if we were obliged whenever a political change occurred in a country to make corresponding changes in the order of the Church's hierarchy, we should be logically forced to say that Christ built His Church upon shifting sands, and not, as He affirms, upon a foundation against which even the gates of hell cannot prevail. In fact a handful of soldiers or the caprice of a sovereign would suffice to raze the divine edifice to the ground.

Notwithstanding the increasing ambition of the bishops of Constantinople the Pope's confirmation of every new patriarch continued, before as well as after Photius, to be regarded as indispensable, or at least of great importance as establishing the orthodoxy of the newly elected bishop. Thus Photius himself, though he usurped the see of Constantinople, did not fail to send an embassy to Rome to ask Pope Nicholas I. to confirm him. Photius's letter to the sovereign Pontiff contained a profession of orthodox faith for which he was commended by the head of the Church, but the confirmation was refused, and the usurper excommuni-

clergy of Constantinople still follow Catholic traditions on this point. We know, in fact, that the metropolitans of Chalcedon, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Heraclea, Cyzicus are members of the supreme council of the Patriarch of Constantinople and have enjoyed numerous and important privileges. The reason of this is that these cities now only unimportant towns or villages were formerly celebrated places or capitals of great provinces. If the vicissitudes of human politics involve corresponding changes in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, these metropolitans should long since have resigned their privileges to the bishops of Candia, Smyrna, Thessalonica, Rhodes, and of many other cities. Moreover, if the Greek schismatics were consistent, if the motive alleged by John the Faster had a reasonable foundation, the Bishop of Constantinople should long since have resigned the title of Universal Patriarch, for Byzantium has ceased for centuries to be the capital of the Byzantine empire. The ostentatious title is all the more ridiculous that at the present day this patriarch's jurisdiction does not include even a sixth of the Christians of the Eastern Church.

cated in a Roman Council. It was only after a reconciliation, followed by a new excommunication uttered by Pope John VIII., that Photius removed his mask and threw off what he called the yoke of Rome. Then, to give his revolt a semblance of reason, he claimed that the popes, by tolerating the addition of the word *Filioque* to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed, had become heretical. It is worthy of remark, however, that this protest was never made until four hundred years after the addition of the word. Also that it was only later, after the separation, that the dispute concerning the opportuneness of the addition of the word *Filioque* degenerated into a dogmatic question relative to the procession of the Holy Spirit, the clergy of Constantinople claiming that the Holy Spirit proceeded only from the Father.[1]

After Photius the two churches remained united until the time of Michael Cerularius (1054–1059), who renewed the charges formulated by Photius against the Church of Rome, and completed the separation from the universal Church. Later a reconciliation was effected and solemnly proclaimed in the Council of Florence held in 1439 under the pontificate of Eugene IV.; but the bad will of the clergy of Constantinople rendered this reconciliation, which would have been so salutary, almost null.[2]

[1] It would be easy to prove that this procession of the Holy Ghost, as the Catholic Church teaches it, has always been universally believed; it was, moreover, authentically recognized by the Greeks in the Ecumenical Council of Florence, in which the perfect agreement of the Greek and Latin Fathers on the subject of this dogma has been attested by both parties. In the Council held at Toledo in 448 the word *Filioque* itself was added only to cut short the heresy of the Sabellians and Priscillians, who used the Nicene Creed to deny that the Holy Spirit was consubstantial with the Father. Hunter, II., n. 415.

[2] It is unnecessary to observe that this union of the two churches established by an Ecumenical Council still exists legally. In fact, no later Council having abrogated or modified this solemn act, signed

The Greek schism has spread through Turkey, Greece, Austria, and Russia; but the importance of the Russian nation requires that we give a few special details of the introduction of schism into this country.[1]

It would be a great mistake to suppose that this vast country was won over to schism at the period of its conversion to Christianity. It was only at the end of the tenth century, when the Eastern and Western churches were united in faith and government, that Russia received in a stable and definite manner the benefit of the Catholic faith. It owed this benefit to the Princess Olga, regent of the kingdom from 945 to 955. Her sincere conversion accelerated the movement toward Christianity; but the movement was not definite and complete until the reign of her grandson Wladimir the Great, or the Apostolic. The zealous prince brought Greek priests to teach the Russian people the principles of the Christian religion. This fact explains the great influence which the Byzantine clergy exercised from the beginning over this neophyte people—an influence which led later to the introduction of schism into the powerful nation.

As a matter of fact the present religion of Russia is not more Greek than Prussian or Anglican. Though at the period when it embraced the schism it had a metropolitan immediately dependent on the Patriarch of Constantinople, it has long since broken the bond which united it to this great centre of the schism of the East.

by spontaneous and universal consent, it preserves to-day its legal and canonical force; consequently in the eyes of every enlightened Greek of good faith the sovereign Pontiff, the successor of Peter, is the supreme and lawful head of the Eastern as well as the Western Church.

[1] On the *Russian* Schism see Palmer, W., Visit to the Russian Church; Wallace, Russia; Gagarin, The Russian Clergy; A. C. Q. xi. 505; D. R. Old Ser. xxiii. 406, New Ser. xxviii. 277, III. Ser. v. 422, x. K 120, Jan. '93, p. 1; Tondini, Future of the Russian Church; Parsons, Lies and Errors, p. 304; C. W. Apr. 1900.

In 1589 the Metropolitan of Moscow was raised to the patriarchal dignity; but Peter the Great suppressed the patriarchate, and from that time the Russian Church has been governed by the so-called Holy Synod, which acts in the name and by the authority of the emperor, and is usually presided over by an officer of the court. Thus, separated not only from Rome and Constantinople, but from any patriarch whatever, united most intimately with the autocratic government which rules all the Russias, it is simply the national religion of Russia, and should be called Muscovitism.[1]

It is not surprising that the Church of Russia should of late years assume the title of "Orthodox." Has there ever been a heretical or schismatic sect which did not claim to possess the true doctrine? Moreover, we readily acknowledge that the entire Greek Church, very different in this respect from Protestant sects, has always preserved, and still preserves unaltered, almost all the dogmas of faith as it held them before the separation, and as the Church of Rome teaches them. This is very evident from the institutions of the Greek Church, from the writings of the Fathers most revered by it, from the prayers, the canticles, daily chanted in the offices and ceremonies of its worship, from the relig-

[1] Peter I., by the institution of the Holy Synod and by the promulgation of ecclesiastical rule, destroyed even the appearance of independence in the Russian clergy. His successors have aggravated the evil. It is well known that the composition of this synod depends entirely on the good pleasure of the emperor, and that all its acts are subject to the approbation of a minister of the czar bearing the title of Procurator of the Synod. Moreover, in the ecclesiastical seminaries and academies the nomination and the deposition of the professors, the choice of classic works, the methods of teaching are all regulated by the government. Thus Protestants and notorious infidels have held professorships in the institutions; the text-books adopted were for a long time, and probably still are, Protestant. One can readily divine what must be the fate of the faith of clergy and people under such a system. There is no reason to be astonished at the great progress which Protestantism has made among the Russian clergy.

ious practices and traditions of the people belonging to the Eastern rite.[1]

I. The Greek Church has Neither Unity of Belief nor of Ministry.

A. Unity of belief, to be possible, necessarily requires an authority, a tribunal capable of giving infallible decisions in matters of faith. Now the Greek Church is deprived of such a tribunal. Perhaps it will be said that the Patriarch of Constantinople constitutes such a tribunal. But, first of all, whence does the patriarch derive his authority? Christ gave but one head to His Church, and this head, as we shall presently show, is St. Peter, and after him his successors, the bishops of Rome. What could deprive the successor of St. Peter of his divine authority, recognized for more than eight centuries, and cause it to be transferred to the Patriarch of Constantinople? Certainly not, as we have just proved, Constantine's choice of Byzantium as the capital of his new empire. The authority which the Church of Rome has received immediately from Christ resides so intrinsically in her that no Council can modify or alter it.

On the other hand, the third decree of the first Council of Constantinople (381) which raised the patriarch of this city above those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, ranked him second to the Bishop of Rome. Now it is important to

[1] Protestants are frequently heard to refer triumphantly to the obstinacy with which the Greeks have persisted in their schism and in their hatred of the Church of Rome, totally unconscious that these schismatics witness against them. In fact the dogmas which we believe, are, with but little difference, publicly taught by the Greek Church. Now these obstinate enemies evidently did not borrow these dogmas from the Church of Rome after their separation from her. Therefore we must admit that they have always been believed in the East as well as in the West. But what becomes, then, of the accusation of inventing new dogmas made by Protestants against the Church? And why did not they themselves join the Eastern Church when they revolted against Rome?

bear in mind that the Schismatic Greek Church acknowledges the authority of the first seven Councils. The Greek Schismatics have been logically forced to adopt a conciliary system. They admit in principle that in doubtful questions of faith the patriarchs united in council have the right to give doctrinal decisions. But no such assembly of patriarchs has ever been convened since Michael Cerularius. In doubtful points of dogma recourse is had to the first seven General Councils. But who would venture to affirm that all points of dogma and morals were fixed in these early Councils, or that they could possibly settle all controversies which may arise to the end of time? Moreover, there is an evident contradiction in the system of the Greeks: if, as they allege, the General Councils can decide doubtful questions in matters of faith, on what ground do they reject the authority of the Ecumenical Councils which were held after the first seven? Finally, this is decisive: if it is true that the first seven General Councils furnish the reply to all controverted questions, let them cite the Ecumenical Council which defines that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.

B. As to unity of government, there is no trace of it in the Greek Church. The dependence of the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch upon the Church of Constantinople is merely nominal; that of the Russian Church is null. In one the patriarchs and bishops are subject to the head of the Turkish empire, in the other the Russian Synod is completely controlled by the czar. Such is the deplorable state of the Eastern Church. It would be difficult to recognize it as the one free Church which Christ founded upon Peter, the one fold under the care of the one and the same shepherd; or to believe that it was to these temporal rulers that Christ addressed the divine command: "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs."

It is evident from the historic sketch that the only bond which unites the various factions forming the Schismatic Greek Church and entitles them to a generic name is their

common refusal of obedience to the successors of St. Peter in the see of Rome: it is their common and persistent revolt against the religious authority established by Christ Yet this authority of Rome was recognized by the Greeks themselves until the ninth century, or, to be more exact, until the middle of the eleventh, and again formally accepted by them at the Council of Florence in 1439.

II. The Greek Church does Not Possess Sanctity.

Who would venture to say that the authors of the Greek schism have signalized themselves by sanctity, and that their revolt against the lawful and ancient authority of the see of Peter was founded upon virtuous motives, and not upon ambition or still less avowable passions? Undoubtedly among the million schismatics born and reared in good faith in the Greek Church, who have with Catholics the grace of the sacraments, the benefits of the holy sacrifice, and of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, there are many souls pleasing to God and worthy of His favors. But where, we ask, are the saints produced by this Church since its separation; where the men of constant and heroic virtue worthy to be compared with the saints of the Church of Rome? By what striking and incontestable miracles has God manifested the heroic virtue of persons held up in Russia to the veneration of the masses? We refrain from speaking of the moral degradation and the vices with which large numbers of the Russian clergy are charged. If such things are the result of human frailty in the ministers of the altar, we have a right to expect, at least on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, earnest and constant efforts to raise the priesthood from this state of ignorance and abasement and render it less unworthy of the respect of the people.

III. The Greek Church does Not Possess Catholicity.

Since it ceased, by its revolt, to form part of the Catholic Church, it is not only confined to a few countries of the East and to Russia, but it is far from being everywhere the same. As to the Russian Church in particular, its very name clearly demonstrates that it is not the Church of Christ, for Our Saviour did not establish national Churches; He decreed, on the contrary, that there should be but one fold under one shepherd. If the Russians claim that their Church forms part of the Greek Church, it is contrary to all evidence, since no hierarchal tie unites the two Churches, the Patriarch of Constantinople being no less a stranger to the Russian Church than to the Bishop of Rome. We are aware that epistolary relations are now established between the Synod of St. Petersburg and the schismatic Greek patriarchs. But we fail to see in what way these recent relations essentially modify the present situation, and particularly in what way they change the situation which existed during the previous centuries. Nor is this schismatic Church, despite the immense territory of the empire which protects it, Catholic in numbers. According to a recent census the schismatic Slavs number little more than eighty million. Though closely united by the strongest national spirit, they are far from possessing religious unity. Notwithstanding the iron hand of the autocracy which endeavors to prevent the irruption of schisms, the country swarms with sects of every kind, known as Raskolniks, chief of which are the Starowierzi, or "Men of the Old Faith." These dissenters, who have broken with the Holy Synod, just as the Synod broke with the Patriarch of Constantinople and as the latter broke with Rome, may be counted by millions. How long would this religious body stand if the temporal power which holds it together were to withdraw its support and abandon it to its fate?

The spirit of proselytism established by the words of the divine Master: "Go teach all nations," hardly exists in the

Russian Church. True, every year the Procurator of the Synod submits to the emperor and publishes a report in which a special chapter is devoted to propagandism. There is no denying that the number of recruits increases in proportion as the empire increases its frontiers; but this is not due to the apostolic devotion of its missionaries, or to the blood of its martyrs. The first page of its martyrology is still unwritten; but to make amends it counts by millions the unhappy children of Catholic Poland, from whom it endeavors to wrest their faith by violent and persistent persecution.

IV. The Greek Church does Not Possess Apostolicity.

Her doctrine varies, hence it is not that of the apostles. During the first nine, or rather eleven, centuries of the Catholic Church, the East as well as the West believed in the primacy of the Pope of Rome and in the procession of the Holy Spirit as we ourselves believe and teach it. Numerous and most convincing proofs of this are to be found in Pitzipious' *L'Eglise Orientale*, and in the *Bibliotheca græca orthodoxa* of Assemani. The Greek Church now no longer admits these two dogmas, hence it has varied. It teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and that He rests in the Son; it makes the personal distinction between the Son and the Holy Spirit consist in the mode of receiving existence, one by generation, the other by procession, while denying at the same time that this difference comes from any relation in their origin.[1]

Nor have they preserved apostolicity of ministry, for

[1] We shall not speak of other points of difference, for example purgatory. In reality the difference between the two churches here consists in the word used to designate this place of expiation. The schismatics reject absolutely the word purgatory, but that they admit the reality of a place of temporary expiation, as well as the efficacy of prayers for the dead, is manifestly evident from their liturgy, their canticles, and their religious customs and institutions.

their revolt against the authority to which they had been submissive for so many centuries broke the chain which united them to the apostles by the legitimate transmission of pastoral jurisdiction.

Conclusion.

In concluding our remarks upon the Greek schism we are happy to call our readers' attention to the movement indicating a return toward the centre of Catholic unity which begins to be manifested in the Greek Church. This is so marked that the historian Pogodine and several other Russian writers frankly acknowledge that if religious liberty were tolerated in Russia half the orthodox peasants would become Raskolniks, who are very powerful despite all the persecutions they have endured, and half the higher classes would embrace Catholicism. Quite recently a learned Russian, who is not a Catholic, M Soloviev, son of the celebrated historian of the same name, addressed to an archpriest and through him to all the prelates of the separated Eastern Church, a series of nine questions which not only show the perplexities and doubts of a number of distinguished minds in regard to the alleged orthodoxy of the schismatic Church, but seem to indicate a serious step toward Catholic unity. It is curious also to read in *L'idée russe*, a work of this same Soloviev, the very significant judgment pronounced upon his own Church by I. S. Aksakov, one of the heads of the Russian party and a declared enemy of the Church of Rome. After justifying his statements by a long series of incontestable facts he concludes his examination of the Russian Church thus: "The spirit of truth, the spirit of charity, the spirit of life, the spirit of liberty, these are what the Russian Church is deficient in" (Œuvres complètes d'Ivan Aksakov, t. iv.).

Let us redouble our prayers that this Russian people, so remarkable for its vigor, its religious spirit, and its patriotism, may finally understand that its salvation, from a social as well

as religious point of view, lies in the Catholic Church; and that it may be convinced that no sacrifice is asked of its national pride; that the popes desire less than ever to impose upon it the rites and disciplinary customs of the Latin Church. Only recently has Leo XIII., far from attempting to Latinize the Catholics of Roumania, constituted himself a sincere and earnest defender of the rites and customs of the ancient Churches of the East. If he earnestly desires to bring back his separated children to the faith, it is with no idea of injuring or weakening their national and religious traditions.

After all, the Russian Church has only to unite again the broken chain of its ancient traditions, to return to the doctrine taught it by the first apostles of the Slavs, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, consecrated bishops by Pope Adrian II.; to return to the doctrine of the most illustrious Doctors of the East, of Athanasius, of Gregory, of Chrysostom, of Theodorus the Studite, of Cyril, of Ignatius, all of whom remained faithfully united with the see of Rome, and received its teaching and decrees with filial submission. The Russian Church's claim to be the daughter of the schismatic Church of Constantinople rests on a false historical basis. Her true mother is the Catholic Church, formerly acknowledged by the patriarchs of Constantinople, as well as by the missionaries who brought her the faith.

We may fitly end this article by giving the consoling words of Leo XIII.'s admirable encyclical to the Princes and Peoples of the Universe, June 20, 1894: "We cannot give up the consoling hope that the time is not far distant when the Churches of the Orient, so illustrious by the faith of their ancestors and their ancient glories, will return to the doctrine upon which they parted from us." "You have no reason," he further tells them, "to fear, as a consequence of your return to Catholic unity, any curtailment of your rights, of the privileges of your patriarchs, or of the rites and customs of your respective churches. For it has always been and

will ever be the intention of the Holy See, as it has been her most constant tradition, to treat all nations with a noble spirit of condescension and to show the greatest consideration for their origin and customs."

ART. V.—THE PRIMACY OF THE SEE OF PETER, OR THE PAPACY.[1]

This question belongs naturally to the chapter which follows, but we treat it here because the primacy of the Roman Pontiff affords a new, distinctive mark, easily recognized and sufficient of itself to distinguish the true Church of Christ from heretical and schismatic sects.

We must carefully distinguish, first of all, the primacy of jurisdiction from primacy of honor, or primacy of directive authority.

Primacy of honor is only a simple right of precedence which in no way confers the right to govern or even to direct. The primacy of directive authority is that of the president of our legislative assemblies, the right to direct the discussion of affairs. The primacy of jurisdiction is quite another thing; it is the real right to govern, and includes the triple power, legislative, judiciary, and coercive. Such is the primacy which Christ bestowed, in all its fulness, upon Peter, and which Protestants deny him.

First Thesis.—Christ Conferred upon St. Peter the Primacy of Jurisdiction over the Whole Church.

First Argument, drawn from the Words of Christ.—Among the words addressed by Our Lord to St. Peter there are some which contain the promise to confer upon him the primacy and others which are the fulfilment of this promise.

[1] Allies; Alnatt; Botalla; De Maistre; Hettinger; Humphrey; Kenrick; Lindsay; Murphy; Preston; Rivington; Spald-ng, J. M, Evidences, l. 11, 12; Lockhart, Old Rel., ch. 8 ff.; Hunter, vol. i., Schanz, III., ch. 12, 13; A. C. Q. xix. 691; C. W. xxxv. 105.

a. THE PROMISE.—Jesus having asked His disciples assembled about Him whom they thought He was, Peter answered in his own name, and publicly proclaimed the divinity of his Master, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and Jesus, delighted with this profession of faith, immediately answered, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matth. xvi. 15 ff.)

It is very evident that these words, than which nothing could be clearer, were addressed, not to the apostolic college, but to Peter. There could be no ambiguity in the words of incarnate Wisdom, particularly when there was question of so important a promise. The Master spoke to be understood, and He wished that there should be no misapprehension of His meaning. That Protestants should explain these words of Our Saviour quite otherwise is not astonishing; it is a case where the letter killeth and the spirit quickeneth.[1]

The importance of the question itself requires that we should develop it somewhat. Let us observe, first, that the two expressions, "Thou art Peter" (*Petrus*) and "upon this rock" (*petra*), both apply to Peter. The Greek, like the Latin, changes from the masculine to the feminine, but this

[1] It is well to remark in passing that Protestants, following their system of free interpretation have succeeded in discovering in this very clea. text at least ten not only different but contradictory meanings. Some say that Our Lord addressed, not Peter individually, but the apostolic college represented in Peter. In truth this would have been a very extraordina y and unexpected reward granted to the faith of Peter and announced in such solemn terms. Others claim that by "THIS ROCK" He meant His *own person;* but why then did Our Saviour use the future tense, "I will build" and not "I bu'ld"? Is it not evident, moreover, that *ædificabo* (I will build) and *dabo* (I will give) are intimate'y united by the sense of the whole context; that if one of these two verbs designate Peter, the other also does?

is not the case with the Syro-Chaldaic, the tongue in which Our Saviour spoke, or with the majority of the Eastern versions, or even with the Hebrew text, which is considered to be the original text of St. Matthew; it is absolutely the *same word* (*Cephas*) which is repeated: "Thou art rock, and upon this rock." As to the Greek, the best authors use πέτρα or πέτρος to signify a stone, a rock.

Moreover, the demonstrative *this*, upon *this* rock, found in all texts, leaves no room for doubt. As to the pronoun *it* at the end of the phrase, whether it refers to rock or to church does not alter the general sense; for if, according to the promise of Christ, the power of hell is never to prevail against the Church, it is because the Church is built upon Peter, established as the foundation of this spiritual edifice, the basis of which is authority.

Let us now show that Our Saviour gave Peter the *fulness of power*. In fact the foundation upon which a perfect society rests can be only the supreme authority which governs it. Just as the solidity of an edifice and the adherence of all its parts, nay, its very existence, depends upon its foundation, so the stability, the unity, the very existence of the Church rests upon Peter. The Church, therefore, would not exist without Peter; where he is, there is the Church: *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia* (St. Ambrose). But to produce the result intended by Our Saviour this authority must be full and entire; it must include the triple powers—legislative, judiciary, and coercive; in other words, Peter must be invested with the primacy not only of honor, but of power, of jurisdiction. His authority must extend over the entire Church, over the apostles as well as over the faithful: it was not a portion of His Church which Jesus gave him to govern, that of Rome, for example, or Antioch; it was His Church, the entire religious society which He founded.

The words which follow in the text of St. Matthew, and which were also addressed only to Peter, bear no less conclusive testimony in favor of the primacy of Peter: "And I

will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." [1]

It is well known that in the language of the Scriptures, in all Eastern languages, and in others as well, the keys of the kingdom indicate supreme power, sovereignty. Jesus wished that this power should be exercised over all the members of His Church without exception, over all the spiritual rulers as well as over the simple faithful; for

[1] Apropos of this text Ruskin, Sesame and Lilies, p. 41, quotes these lines from Milton:

> "Last came, and last did go,
> The pilot of the Galilean Lake;
> Two massy keys he bore of metals twain
> (The golden opes, the iron shuts amain).
> He shook his mitred locks, and stern bespake," etc.,

and then says: "Let us think over this passage and examine its words. First, is it not singular to find Milton assigning to St. Peter not only his full episcopal function, but the very types of it which Protestants usually refuse most passionately? His 'mitred' locks! Milton was no bishop-lover; how comes St. Peter to be 'mitred'? 'Two massy keys he bore.' Is this, then, the power of the keys claimed by the Bishops of Rome, and is it acknowledged here by Milton only in a poetical license, for the sake of its picturesqueness, that he may get the gleam of the golden keys to help his effect? Do not think it. Great men do not play stage-tricks with doctrines of life and death: only little men do that. Milton means what he says, and means it with his might too—is going to put the whole strength of his spirit presently into the saying of it. For though not a lover of false bishops, he *was* a lover of true ones; and the Lake-pilot is here in his thoughts, the type and head of true episcopal power. For Milton reads that text, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' quite honestly. Puritan though he be, he would not blot it out of the book because there have been bad bishops; nay, in order to understand him, we must understand that verse first; it will not do to eye it askance, or whisper it under our breath, as if it were the weapon of an adverse sect. It is a solemn universal assertion, deeply to be kept in mind by all sects."—TRANSLATOR.

the kingdom of heaven represents here undoubtedly, as in numerous other passages, the Church.

OBJECTION.—It is alleged against this decisive argument in favor of the primacy of Peter that this power to bind and to loose was given later to all the apostles (Matth. xviii. 18). Hence it would seem that the promise made only to Peter did not convey any greater power than was afterward accorded to all the apostles.

ANSWER.—To appreciate the falseness of this conclusion it is sufficient to remark that Christ in addressing only Peter, and in this very solemn manner, promises him not only the power to bind and to loose, but moreover, and first of all, to make him the foundation of His Church and to give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Evidently this promise, given in reward of his personal profession of faith and in such emphatic terms, has some special significance: it must contain something more than the simple promise of the power to bind and to loose. If, therefore, the power to bind and to loose signifies the fulness of power, this something additional must be the primacy of the same power. The power to loose and to bind was given to all, and by the same authority, but not in the *same manner*. Peter, to whom alone the power was first given, received it in all its fulness without any restriction, he was to exercise it over the other apostles; they also received it, but only after Peter, secondarily, and not over him. "Upon one alone," says St. Cyprian, the illustrious bishop of Carthage, "did Christ build His Church, and him He commanded to feed His sheep. And though after His Resurrection He gave to all His apostles the same power to remit sin, yet, in order to manifest unity, He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one. . . . The primacy was given to Peter for the government of one Church and one apostolic chair." The other Fathers hold the same language (see Third Argument). Bossuet, therefore, gives us only the teaching of tradition when he says in his celebrated *Discours*

sur l'unité de l'église: "It was manifestly the intention of Jesus Christ to place first in one alone what He afterwards willed to place in many; but the sequence does not reverse the beginning, and the first does not lose his place. . . . The promises of Christ as well as His gifts are without repentance, and that which He has once given indefinitely and universally is irrevocable; moreover, the power given to several is necessarily restricted by being divided, while power given to one alone, and over all, carries plenitude." If the slightest doubt as to the meaning of Jesus could remain in our minds, He Himself dispels it when He fulfils His promise.

b. THE FULFILMENT OF THE PROMISE.—Our Lord after His Resurrection appeared to seven of His disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, and addressing the apostle who had denied Him thrice, He asked him three times: "Simon son of John, lovest thou Me? (Lovest thou Me more than these?)" Peter answered with a triple and touching protestation of love. Jesus addressed him these solemn and decisive words: "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep" (John xxi. 16, 17). We know that the word *to feed* means, in the Greek text, to rule, to govern. Behold, then, Peter, and Peter alone, established shepherd of the flock of Christ with an authority which is in no way limited. Moreover, in designating the entire Church under the figure of a flock, Jesus explicitly distinguishes in this flock the lambs from the sheep, indicating by the first the simple faithful, and by the second those by whom they are spiritually begotten and who must feed and guide them, that is, the bishops and priests. And in placing Peter over all the fold, Christ Himself, the sovereign Pastor, bestowed upon him the most extended power, the plenitude of power, the primacy of jurisdiction. "All," says Bossuet, "are submitted to the keys given to Peter, kings and peoples, shepherds and sheep. It is Peter who is first commanded to love more than all the other apostles, and then to feed and govern all, the lambs and the sheep, the little ones and the mothers, the shepherds themselves:

shepherds in regard to the people, sheep in regard to St. Peter." Thus did Christ fulfil the promise of conferring upon Peter the supreme authority of His whole Church, of making him the foundation-stone of this edifice.

SECOND ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE FACTS RELATED IN SCRIPTURE.—Peter, in the gospels and in the Acts, is represented as the first and the chief of the apostles, yet there is never any protest on the part of the others, though we know that they were jealous and sensitive in regard to precedence. Thus St. Matthew in enumerating the apostles is not content with naming Peter first, though he was not the first in the order of vocation, but he expressly states *that he is the first.* "The names of the twelve apostles," says he, are these: "the first, Simon who is called Peter." After the Ascension of Our Saviour it is Peter who presides and directs the assembly where St. Matthew is chosen; again, he is the first to preach the Gospel to the Jews, to receive the order to baptize Cornelius and open the Church to the Gentiles. He punishes Ananias and Sapphira for their untruth, and confounds Simon the magician; it is he, again, who proclaims before the tribunal his right and his mission to preach, who works the first miracle in confirmation of the new religion; he is the first, again, to speak in the Council of Jerusalem when "all the multitude held their peace." Cast into prison, he is an object of solicitude to the entire Church, which never ceases to pray for him until he is miraculously delivered; it is he, again, who founds in Asia the see of Antioch, which became for this reason the patriarchal see. Finally, it was he who founded the see of Rome, and because he died bishop of that city, his lawful successors have always had, and will always preserve, the primacy of the universal Church.

Hence we see that St. Peter is, by the will of Christ Himself, the sole founder of the Church, made or appointed the bearer of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the depositary of the sovereign power, the supreme pastor of the entire flock; and that it is with reason that all Catholic tradition,

after naming Peter the prince of the apostles, proclaims the pope the prince of bishops, the Father and Doctor of all Christians, the head of all churches, the supreme pastor of the universal Church, etc.[1]

THIRD ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM TRADITION.—The Fathers of the Church agree in interpreting the above texts in the sense of a veritable primacy of jurisdiction granted to St. Peter. The limits of our work do not permit us to develop this important proof at any length, but we cannot refrain from giving a few texts, particularly from the first centuries, during which time, according to Protestants themselves, the Church of Christ preserved the doctrine of Christ in all its purity. The texts are so clear and explicit that they dispense with all commentary. Let us hear Tertullian first: "Nothing could have been hidden from Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven with the power of binding and loosing upon earth and in heaven, and who was called Peter because upon him as upon a foundation-stone the Church was built." In another place he says: "Our Saviour gave the keys to Peter, and, through Peter, to the Church." Origen declares that though the Church is founded upon all the apostles, Peter nevertheless is "the grand foundation of the Church, the solid rock upon which Christ built it." Peter has received "supreme power to feed the sheep." "Though Our Lord gave all the apostles the power to bind and to loose, nevertheless, in the interest of unity, He spoke only to Peter when He said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'" This is also the opinion of St. Pacian, whose language is identical with that of St. Optatus of Milevum: "In the interest of unity, Peter merited the place at the head of all the apostles, and he was the only one to receive the power of the keys of the kingdom in order to communi-

[1] Livius, St. Peter, Bishop of Rome; Waterworth, The Fathers on St. Peter; also, Faith of Catholics, vol. i.; Hunter, tr. V., ch. 2.

cate it to the others." "Through Peter, Christ confided to the bishops the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

The testimony of Eusebius of Cesarea, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ephrem, St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Eucharius, Bishop of Lyons, and many other Fathers and writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, is no less conclusive in favor of the primacy of jurisdiction than that of the Fathers immediately following the time of the apostles. But we shall be content with mentioning the clear text of St. Leo the Great: "Out of the whole world Peter alone is chosen to preside over the calling of all the Gentiles, and over all the apostles, and the collected Fathers of the Church; so that though there be among the people of God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by personal commission, whom Christ also rules by sovereign power. Beloved, it is a great and wonderful participation of His own power which the divine Condescendence gave to this man; and if He willed that other rulers of the Church should enjoy aught together with him, yet never did He give, save through him, what He denied not to others."

In addition to the authority of the Fathers of the Church, whose unanimity can be explained only by the faithful preservation of apostolic tradition, we have that of the General Councils, which are also the authentic voice of the universal Church (see below, p. 387 ff.).

Second Thesis.—Jesus Christ Desired that this Primacy should Descend to the Lawful Successors of Peter.

This thesis has already been proved apropos of the apostolicity of the ministry. Let us mention, however, a few decisive reasons which relate especially to the primacy.

The form which Jesus Christ gave His Church can be modified only by Him. Now Christ in constituting His Church established a primacy which no one can touch,

much less suppress; hence it must always exist not personally in St. Peter, but in his lawful successors.

Moreover, the text of St. Matthew presents the primacy of St. Peter as the foundation of the Church, without which it cannot exist. It is in fact this primacy which must sustain in the Church unity of government, purity of doctrine, holiness of morals; on it, in a word, depend the stability and the efficacy of the divine work. The foundation of an edifice, and particularly a foundation of this nature, must necessarily endure as long as the edifice itself, that is, according to the divine promises, until the end of time. Now Jesus knew that Peter would not live forever; hence He evidently desired that his ministry and his primacy should be perpetuated until the end of time in his lawful successors.[1]

Remark.—It results from the two preceding theses that the jurisdiction or power of the Pope is *ordinary*, and not restricted to exceptional cases. Jesus Christ in fact made no restrictions when He established Peter the founder of His Church and the pastor of His flock. He desired that this Church should always find its stability in its foundation, and that the flock should never cease to obey its pastor. No doubt the popes, in the interest of good government, usually exercise their jurisdiction in the form of direction and surveillance, leaving to the bishops the initiative, and the freedom of action necessary in the details of an effectual administration; but they do not for this reason lose the rights conferred upon them by the supreme pastor of souls.[2]

[1] The perpetuity of St. Peter's primacy, by the divine ordinance of Christ, is easily proved from the constant tradition of the Church, where it is laid down as the very foundation upon which the Fathers and Councils base their belief in the Roman Primacy.—Editor.

Hergenroether, Cath. Church and Chr. State, I., essay 4; Br. W. xiii. 480.

Third Thesis.—The Church of Rome Possesses the Primacy of the See of Peter.

This is a point concerning which no dispute seems possible. It is very evident that the Catholic Church, and it alone, obeys the successors of St. Peter, the first supreme pastor given to the Church by Christ Himself.[1]

A. Tradition and history afford us such abundant and clear testimony in regard to St. Peter's sojourn in Rome that for thirteen centuries no one thought of questioning it.[2] After the Waldenses, Protestants would naturally try to deny this fact, which was of extreme importance in their controversies with Catholics. Hence they, together with modern unbelievers, left nothing undone to destroy this truth, solidly established by incontrovertible documents, and made still more certain by the labors to which their attacks gave rise. It may be well to give a brief summary of the proofs furnished us by the most authentic records.

1st. The prince of the apostles himself may serve as witness here. In his first epistle addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor he concludes thus: "The Church that is in Babylon saluteth you, so doth my son Mark" (1 Peter v. 13). The word Babylon evidently means here, as well as in various parts of the Apocalypse, the city of Rome, regarded then

[1] "The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, that is of the Pope, is the complex result of doctrine and fact. It supposes the truth of the perpetuity of the Primacy, and the twofold historical fact that Peter was Bishop of Rome and that he made *the Roman Episcopate the sole title of succession.* The question whether Peter was ever in Rome, though not necessarily identical with the fact of his Roman Episcopate, is practically bound up very closely therewith."—Schanz, III., ch. 13, n. 6. See also I. E. R., Oct. 1901; Spalding, Evidences, l. 12, n. 3; Livius, l. c., pt. iii.

[2] Livius, St. Peter; Fouard, St. Peter; Thébaud Church and Gentile World, II., ch. 11; Parsons, Studies, I.; Chatard, Occasional Essays, n. 1; Barnes, St. Peter in Rome; Schanz, III., p. 470 ff.; Murphy, ch. 4; Bishop England's Works, II., p. 370; C. W. ix. 374, xvi. 55, 345; D. R., April, Oct. 1897.

by the Jews as the centre of impiety, as was the Babylon of the East by the Jews of the Captivity. It has always been interpreted in this sense by the Fathers of the Church, with whom even M. Renan fully agrees, as well as the Protestant Grotius. Moreover, the arguments used by unbelieving scholars to overthrow this ancient tradition and prove that the Babylon mentioned in the epistle of St. Peter is a city of the East will not bear serious examination.

2d. At the end of the first century, St. Clement of Rome, disciple of the chief of the apostles, speaking of the faithful sacrificed by Nero after the burning of Rome, mentions among them St. Peter and St. Paul, and he adds these significant words: "They were a great example among us; it was here that they bore the outrages of men and endured all kinds of tortures." It is well known that this saint's epistle is the first Christian writing, outside of the Scriptures, which has come down to us.

Forty years after the death of St. Peter, St. Ignatius dragged from Antioch to Rome, where he became the prey of the beasts of the amphitheater, addressed to the Romans this touching prayer: "I conjure you, show me not unseasonable kindness, let me become food for the beasts. . . . I do not command you like Peter and Paul; they were apostles, and I am only a condemned man." These words are significant only in as far as they admit that the two apostles governed the Church of Rome.

Though the early ages of Christianity afford little explicit testimony in regard to Peter's sojourn at Rome, it is not a matter of astonishment. For, in addition to the fact that but few of the writings of that period have come down to us, no one thought of expressing any doubt upon this subject, nor, consequently, of attesting it; but little attention is given by writers to idle questions during times of persecution. Hence St. Peter's sojourn in the Eternal City is mentioned only incidentally here and there.

3d. A century after the death of St. Peter, the tradition

of his sojourn and of his martyrdom at Rome was universal. Renan himself says: "No one denies that from the end of the second century the general belief of the Christian Churches was that the apostle Peter was martyred at Rome." And Tertullian, who lived in Rome at the end of the second century, says: "Go through the apostolic churches and you will still find the very chairs that were occupied by the apostles, each in its place. If you are near Italy you have Rome. O happy Church, to which the apostles gave their doctrine and their blood; where Peter endured the same suffering as his Master!" "If you go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Way," wrote Caius under the pontificate of Zephyrinus (202–219), "you will find the trophies (tombs) of those who founded this Church." He says elsewhere that Eleutherius was "the thirteenth bishop of Rome after St. Peter."

St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, disciple of St. Polycarp, who was taught by St. John, mentions twice in his treatise against heresies that Peter and Paul founded the Church of Rome. The same testimony is borne by St. Denis of Corinth, St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen. St. Cyprian, martyred in the year 258, calls the Church of Rome the see of Peter. It is useless to quote the Fathers of later times; they are unanimous in their testimony.

4th. The most ancient catalogues, in enumerating the series of Roman pontiffs, always place St. Peter at the head of the list. Such are those of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Optatus of Milevum. Eusebius, who borrowed his list from the memoirs of Hegesippus (175 to 189), writes in his history: "After Peter, the first bishop of Rome was Linus, and Clement was the third." [1]

5th. The same testimony is borne by the monuments, medals, and paintings of the first ages. According to de Rossi, it is the veritable episcopal chair of St. Peter,

[1] D. R., Oct. '98, Apr. '99, on the Succession of the first Roman bishops; Birkhäuser, p. 105; Brück, I., p. 77.

the chair which he used in religious ceremonies, which is venerated as a sacred relic at Rome. The author of the poem against Marcion speaks, in the beginning of the third century, of the real chair in which Peter sat, and in which he commanded that Linus should follow him. Tertullian bears similar testimony in favor of the episcopal throne of St. Peter.

6th. There is no contrary tradition that can be cited against this constant tradition of the first ages of the Church. No city except Antioch boasts of ever having had St. Peter as its first pastor; no one ever thought of locating the tomb of the prince of the apostles anywhere but at Rome. The Ebionitic and Gnostic apocrypha themselves, though they tell us a thousand fables concerning St. Peter, never placed the seat of his episcopacy anywhere but at Rome; finally, among so many heretics and so many schismatics of all times, no one, until the appearance of the Waldenses, or we might say until the Reformers of the sixteenth century, questioned the general belief in this historical fact. Let us add that among Protestants themselves there is a large number of scholars who admit with us St. Peter's sojourn in the Eternal City. We may cite among others Cave, Grotius, Usserius, Basnage, Scaliger, Neander; even Renan finally says: "I think the tradition in regard to Peter's sojourn at Rome probable, but I believe that this sojourn was of brief duration, and that Peter suffered martyrdom shortly after his arrival in the Eternal City."

Hence it is incontestable that St. Peter, martyred in the year 67, came to Rome and died bishop of that city. We may even fix the period of the apostle's arrival, in the year 42, on the authority of the first part of the "Catalogue of Liberius," of the historian Paul Orosius, a writer of the fourth century, of the historian Eusebius, whose chronicles were written about the year 310, and of St. Jerome, born in 246. The latter says: "Simon Peter came to Rome to combat Simon the magician, the second year of the reign of Claudius,

and he occupied the episcopal chair there during twenty-five years, until the last year, that is, until the fourteenth of the reign of Nero." According to the illustrious archæologist J. B. de Rossi the ancient monuments confirm this date completely.

It is to be remarked, moreover, that no ancient author, no monument, either directly or indirectly, contradicts the twenty-five years of the episcopacy of St. Peter, and the learned P. Ch. De Smedt, Bollandist, in his *Dissertationes selectæ* unhesitatingly concludes that the opinion attributing to St. Peter twenty-five years of episcopacy at Rome is "by far the most probable." We must not conclude, however, that St. Peter remained at Rome without ever leaving it during all this period. The contrary is very probable. In fact there is clear mention, notably in Lactantius and in the catalogue of Felix IV., of a second voyage of St. Peter to Rome under the Emperor Nero.[1]

The series of St. Peter's successors is known to us down to Leo XIII. Hence Rome, and consequently the Roman Catholic Church, possesses the See of St. Peter.[2] No sect, moreover, has ever claimed this inheritance.

B. In further proof of our thesis we shall content ourselves with mentioning the first four Councils, which have always been regarded by the Church with special veneration, and considered as almost equal to the four gospels.

The Council of Nice, held in 325, attests in formal terms

[1] Fouard, St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity.

[2] "It is, making allowance for the greater lapse of time between the two extremes, as easy to prove that Pius IX. is the successor of St. Peter in the government of the Church, as that James K. Polk is the successor of George Washington in the presidency of the United States; and the fact of the succession in the former case as much proves that the Church of which Pius IX. is Pope, is the Church of St. Peter, that is, of the apostles, as the succession in the latter case proves that the United States of which Mr. Polk is President is the same political body over which George Washington presided."—Br. ᴡʀ. vi. 479.

that the Roman Church has *always possessed the primacy.*[1] This was so evidently the primacy of jurisdiction that the Council of Sardica, an appendix to that of Nice, acknowledged that a bishop deposed by the Council of the province had a right to appeal from it to the Pope. The second General Council, which was held at Constantinople in 381, also places the Bishop of Rome before the Bishop of Constantinople, the imperial city. In 431 the bishops, assembled for the third time in Ecumenical Council at Ephesus, declared that they deposed the heresiarch Nestorius because they were obliged so to do by the holy canons and by the letter of Pope Celestin, Bishop of the Church of Rome. In the same Council one of the legates of the Pope makes the following declaration, which was received without the slightest protest: "*No one is ignorant of that which has been known at all times, namely, that the holy and blessed Peter, . . . who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven with the power to bind and to loose, has continued to live up to the present time and still lives in his successors, exercising through them the right to judge.*" Then in 451 comes that of Chalcedon, the testimony of which, too long to quote, is still more explicit. Let it suffice to say this is the Council in which, when the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, was read, all the members exclaimed: "*This is the true faith of our fathers, the faith of the apostles; this is our belief; thus do all the orthodox believe. Anathema to him who does not believe the same! Peter has spoken to us thus through Leo.*" In the synodal letter to the Pope his confirmation of the acts of the Council is re-

[1] This is strongly contested by excellent Catholic historians, who deny that the famous Canon VI. of this Council deals at all with the Primacy. See Hefele, History of the Councils, I., p. 397 ff. On the other hand, the above canon does not prove anything against the Roman Primacy. See Parsons, Studies, I., p. 205 ff. On the above Councils and the canons referred to see Hefele, l.c. On the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon in particular see Rivington, The Roman Primacy.—EDITOR.

quired in order that "thy loftiness may accomplish that which is meet towards thy sons."

It is useless to speak of the Councils which followed, the doctrine of which is incontestable. Let us mention only the Council assembled at Florence in 1439, in which the Greeks as well as the Latins signed the following decree of Pope Eugenius IV.: "We define that the holy apostolic see and the Roman Pontiff possess primacy over the whole world; that this same Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the entire Church, the Father and Doctor of all Christians; that to him was given by Our Lord Jesus Christ, in blessed Peter, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church, *as is also declared in the acts of the Ecumenical Councils and in the holy canons.*"

Let us hear, finally, the words of the Vatican Council, in chapter iii. of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. After renewing and developing the definition of the Council at Florence it adds: "If any one say that the Roman Pontiff is charged only with the surveillance or direction and not with plenary and supreme power of jurisdiction over the entire Church, not only in that which relates to faith and morals, but also in matters relating to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world; or, again, that he possesses only the chief share of this power, and not all its fulness; or, finally, that this power which he possesses is not ordinary and immediate, over all the churches as well as over each individually, over all the pastors and the faithful and over each one of them, let him be anathema!" [1]

[1] See the numerous testimonies of the Fathers collected in Faith of Cath., I., p. 59 ff.; Allies, The Throne of the Fisherman; Waterworth, pt. ii.

To prove the primacy of St. Peter and that of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, we may also appeal to all ecclesiastical history. We shall see that from the beginning of the Church, and throughout all the ages, the most positive facts and the most undeniable testimony witness to the faith of pastors and of the faithful in the primacy of

The logical and indisputable result of our thesis is that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church, since she alone possesses the centre and foundation of the Church, and she alone has preserved her first organization in all its integrity.

the See of Rome. But we do not think it necessary to dwell upon these historical facts, which may, moreover, be found in numerous works. We may quote particularly the 69th conference of P. Ollivier. "We should never finish," he says at the conclusion of one of his conferences, "if we were to quote all the instances in which the Churches of the East and of the West appeal to Rome, either to ask support of the Pope in their struggle with error, or to obtain from him the re-establishment of their episcopal sees, of which they had been unjustly deprived, or to consult him upon doubtful questions relating to faith or discipline. . . . A fact which of itself demonstrates the primacy of the Pope is that never in the East or in the West was a single Council, even among the most important, recognized as ecumenical, that is, as representing the universal Church, unless it was convened, at least implicitly, by the Pope, and presided over or confirmed by him. . . . Since the concurrence of the popes was considered as essential by the entire Church, the entire Church, by this fact, recognized their primacy of power and of jurisdiction."—See Kenrick, Primacy, ch. 13; Allies, See of Peter, ch. 5, n. 5, 6.

CHAPTER III.

CERTAIN PREROGATIVES CONFERRED BY JESUS CHRIST UPON HIS CHURCH.

The Church, in order to carry out effectually her mission of saving souls to the end of time, must needs have certain privileges or prerogatives which are quite indispensable to accomplish her purpose. Among these the principal are *indefectibility*, or perpetual, uninterrupted, and unchangeable existence through all the changes, evolutions, and revolutions of the centuries; *authority*, that is, spiritual rights and powers over the souls of men as well as over the means of salvation; *infallibility*, which is the divine guaranty of the unfailing exercise of the Church's authority; *sovereignty*, or absolute freedom and independence of any and all earthly power.

In the next four articles we shall prove that the all-wise and all-powerful Founder of the Church did endow her with these supernatural attributes. Lastly, we shall treat of *Liberalism*, the great heresy of the nineteenth century, which denies to the Catholic Church most of the above-mentioned prerogatives.

ART. I.—INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.[1]

Taken in its broadest acceptation the indefectibility of the Church is the duration that Jesus Christ promised her until the end of the world, with the maintenance of her interior constitution and her exterior form, with the preser-

[1] Spalding, J. M., Evidences, 10; Manahan, Triumph, etc.; Br. W. xiii. 384; C. W. xlix. 761; Hunter, I., n. 166 ff.

vation of all her properties and her prerogatives. The Church can, of course, admit, in the series of centuries, disciplinary changes required for the good of souls, but she will never be deprived of one of her constituent elements (her members, her chiefs, her organization), nor of any of her essential properties (unity, sanctity, catholicity), nor of her divine prerogatives (authority, infallibility).

Let us observe at the same time that this promise of indefectibility is made to the universal Church, and not to each of her parts, or to particular churches. The latter may fall away or disappear; but despite these shipwrecks the true Church of Christ will always remain, ever the same; these defections, moreover, will be compensated by the conquest or the foundation of new churches. Protestants, sometimes openly, sometimes covertly, reject this indefectibility. No doubt the invisible Church, many of them say, cannot fail, but it is quite otherwise with the visible Church, which may disappear from the world for a greater or shorter time; and this they allege is what has taken place.[1]

Thesis.—Jesus Christ Wished His Church to Endure without any Essential Change until the End of Time.

First Argument.—A great number of texts in the Old Testament clearly defines the perpetuity of the reign of Christ. Let us limit ourselves to quoting a verse from Daniel, ii. 44: "But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people, and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand forever." The synagogue, which was to change its form and receive an essential perfection, is frequently contrasted with the king-

[1] The modern fiction, defended by Lasaulx, Döllinger and others, of a triple successive development of the Church, called respectively the Petrine, the Pauline, and the Johannine Churches, is clearly condemned by the Vatican Schema on the Church, ch. 8 and can. 8.—Editor.

dom of the Messias, the New Covenant, the Christian Church, which was to exist forever, and remain always the same. This is an argument frequently used by St. Paul, particularly in his Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 6 ff.; xii. 27, 28).

Second Argument.—The New Testament is no less explicit (Matth. xiii. 24, coll. 30, 39; 1 Cor. xv. 24 f.).

a. In a text already quoted, which has become classic and dispenses with commentary, Jesus, with His supreme authority, confirms this indefectibility: "And I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell *shall not prevail against it*" (Matth. xvi. 18).

b. Christ, sole mediator between God and man, has confided the fruits of His Redemption and the means of salvation to the Church. Now there will always be souls to be saved by these means; hence Christ, in sending the apostles to teach and to baptize, promises to be with them *all days, even to the consummation of the world* (Matth. xxviii. 20). But this perpetual indefectibility of the apostolic ministry, on which everything depends in the Church, evidently entails that of the Church itself. (Cfr. 1 Tim. ii. 4.)

Third Argument, drawn from Theological Reasons.—If the Church could ever fail, she would, by this very fact, lose irrevocably all efficacious authority. In fact all who chose to rebel against the Church could justly claim that she had failed in her mission, that she had become corrupt, that she no longer merited either their confidence or obedience. Was it not on this ground that the innovators of the sixteenth century sought to justify their rebellion?

ART II—AUTHORITY OR POWERS OF THE CHURCH.[1]

We have seen that, by the will of Jesus Christ, the Church is a real society. We shall now prove that Christ in founding

[1] Spalding, J. L., lecture 4; Lacordaire, conf. 2 on the Church; Hunter, I., tr. 4, ch. 4; Br. W. viii. 359, 574; C. W. xlii. 158, 324.

His Church conferred upon her all the power necessary to continue the work of redemption till the end of the world. This power is threefold, representing the threefold office of Christ as teacher, priest, and king: first, the power to teach revealed truths and to impose her teaching (*Magisterium*); second, the power of exercising the sacred priesthood and of dispensing the divine mysteries (*Ministerium*); third, the power of government and administration over all her members (*Imperium*). Although we have already proved the existence of these three powers in the Church, it will not be useless to put here briefly whatever refers to them.

Speaking of the apostolicity of the Church, we mentioned (p. 329) only two powers given to the chiefs of the Church, that of order and that of jurisdiction.[1] But there we considered these powers in regard to the *sources* from which they flow (ordination and institution), while here we shall view them in regard to the *objects* to which they relate.

I. The Power to Teach.

The Church has received from her divine Founder the power to teach, or doctrinal authority, that is, the right and duty to preach the moral and dogmatic doctrine of Jesus Christ, and to impose this doctrine upon all men.[2] This truth is so evident that we shall content ourselves with merely mentioning the following brief arguments:

First Argument.—As the doctrine of Jesus Christ can be made known only by teaching, the Church, in receiving the mission to make this doctrine known everywhere, must necessarily have received also the power to *teach* all men. (See Rom. x. 14 ff.)

Second Argument.—The words of Jesus Christ on this

[1] *Magisterium*, being the *authoritative* teaching and thus implying the right to preach and to demand both the "obedience unto faith" as well as the public profession of that faith, is quite appropriately referred to the power of jurisdiction.—Editor.

[2] Ward. Essays on the Doctrinal Authority of the Church.

subject are sufficiently clear and well known: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth; going therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matth. xxviii. 18, 19). "He that heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." (Luke x. 16.)

THIRD ARGUMENT.—The apostles, strengthened by these words of their Master, devoted themselves immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit to the ministry of preaching. "Going forth, they preached everywhere," says St. Mark, "the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed." To those who would forbid them the exercise of this teaching they answered with the celebrated words which have become the motto of every true Christian brought face to face with tyrannical power: "We must obey God rather than men." Or again: "We cannot but speak" (Mark xvi. 20; Acts v. 29; iv. 20).

REMARKS.—1st. The Church's manner of teaching is always twofold. The ordinary teaching is that which is administered daily through the bishops or their delegates and under their surveillance, by the aid of preaching, or catechising, or theological lectures, etc. The extraordinary teaching is that which is given by the Pope, or the Councils when they proclaim a dogma or condemn an error. It is evident that the extraordinary form of teaching is in no way required to make a doctrine an article of faith to Christians, otherwise the dogma of the Eucharist, for example, would not have been of faith before the tenth century, and in our own day the visibility of the Church, her indefectibility, etc., would not be articles of faith, since they have never been solemnly defined. The Church cannot err in her *constant* and *universal* teaching any more than in her definitions of dogma. The promises made by Christ admit of no exception. Heresy may consist, therefore, in denying wittingly a dogma proclaimed by the ordinary and uniform teaching of the entire Church.

2d. In consequence of this mission and this power the Church is obliged to maintain the purity of faith, to guard the faithful against erroneous, impious, and immoral doctrines, to forbid the reading of books and papers that might corrupt faith and morals, to supervise all dogmatic and moral teaching given in society by any teachers whether private or official, that is, appointed by the state. No one will dispute this point when there is question of a Christian society. But even though the constitution be based upon liberty of worship, the state, if it truly respect liberty, cannot refuse the Church this surveillance, which is an integral part of the Catholic apostolate. The state should, moreover, at least for its Catholic subjects, allow ecclesiastical superiors power to exercise an efficacious control over the various branches of human knowledge usually taught by lay professors. Otherwise the liberty awarded the Church would be a fallacy, since official pedagogues could, in teaching science, for example, astronomy, or history, or literature, attack, contradict, or neutralize the lessons, the dogmas, and the moral teaching of the Church. Finally, with still greater reason may the Church claim the right to brand and condemn the anti-religious, atheistical, and so-called neutral (unsectarian) teaching organized under the patronage of the state. In cases of this kind she must have recourse to every means in her power, to every spiritual arm in her possession, to preserve her children from the baneful influence of such teaching.

These reflections suffice to make us understand and, at the same time, to justify the Church's attitude toward governments which have promulgated similar legislation. It explains the conduct of the Belgian Episcopacy, who in 1869, with admirable energy, saved their country from the corruption of irreligious schools.[1]

[1] It explains in particular the wonderful system of parochial schools in the United States of America, established and maintained by the

II. Power to Confer the Sacraments.

The Church has received the power of regulating all that concerns the administration of the sacraments, the celebration of the holy sacrifice, of deciding, in a word, all that belongs to public worship.

First Argument.—How could the Church fulfil her mission of saving souls if, while enlightening minds with the light of revelation, she did not at the same time impart the strength absolutely indispensable for the observance of the precepts imposed by revelation? Now it is through the sacraments, through the sacrifice of the Mass particularly, and through the exercises of her worship, that the faithful obtain the graces necessary for the maintenance of the spiritual life.

Second Argument.—Our Saviour's will in this respect is very clear. Thus we see that when He gave His apostles the command and the power to teach He also imposed upon them the obligation to baptize all men; at the Last Supper, after distributing His body and blood to them, He bade them do the same in remembrance of Him; on another occasion He gave them the power to forgive sins, so that they alone had the power to loose and to bind.

Third Argument.—The apostles themselves affirm this power implicitly by exercising it, and explicitly by their words. In fact we see them baptizing, confirming, ordaining, celebrating Mass, ministering to the sick, etc., and St. Paul writes: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1).

III. Power to Govern.[1]

The right of self-government given to the Church comprises three distinct powers similar to those possessed by

strenuous efforts of the Catholic priests and bishops and the enormous but voluntary contributions of the faithful.—Editor.

[1] Burnet, Path, etc., ch. 3.

civil society: legislative power, or the right to make laws and rules binding upon all the subjects of the Church; judiciary power, to define the sense and reach of her laws, to decide disputed cases, to pronounce judgment upon guilt, etc.; and, finally, executive or coercive power, that is, the right to procure, by the necessary means, particularly by the use of penalties either spiritual or temporal, the observance of the laws which she imposes on her members. The present adversaries of the Church rarely deny her the first two powers, that of teaching and of administering the sacraments; they are, in fact, of little importance to them. But they make fierce war against this power of governing, as to do away with it would create great disorder in the economy of the Church, and she would no longer be able to repress the revolts of her members and to resist the violent attacks or silent intrigues of her enemies.

They allege that the Church has no right to make laws, to judge crimes, to punish the guilty; or if she has any right in these matters, it is not an inherent right of her constitution, but a right which she receives through participation or communication with the civil power, through the courteous concession of rulers, or perhaps through usurpation made possible by the negligence or the connivance of governments. Let us prove, therefore, that the Church has really received this power from Christ.

First Argument.—A society cannot really exist and attain its end without the power to govern. A multitude of wills seeking to attain the same end necessarily requires common and efficacious guidance. Hence, when it pleased Our Saviour to unite in a perfect society all who believed in Him, He could not but endow this society with the authority necessary to accomplish its mission. In other words, He had to establish heads and rulers invested with a triple power, legislative, judiciary, and coercive; a law supposes the right to judge the guilty and to inflict punishment.

Second Argument, drawn from the Words of Scrip-

TURE already quoted and explained in speaking of the ministry of the apostles and the primacy of St. Peter.

THIRD ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE CONDUCT OF THE APOSTLES AND THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.—The apostles from the beginning exercised all these powers, making laws, pronouncing judgment, hurling anathemas at the guilty and the rebellious without consulting the civil power or even despite its opposition (Acts xv. 28; 1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 33, 34; vii. 12, 13; v. 3, 4, 5; iv. 21; xi. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 2.) The Church in the centuries which followed continued to exercise the same powers in virtue of the authority properly belonging to her; nor has belief in the legislative authority of lawful heads ever varied in the Church.[1]

ART. III.—INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.[2]

I. ITS NATURE AND NECESSITY.

NATURE.—To be infallible, generally speaking, is to possess the privilege of never deceiving or being deceived; this privilege in regard to the Church means that she can neither alter the doctrine of Jesus Christ, nor misunderstand the true meaning of what our divine Saviour taught, commanded, or prohibited. No doubt God only is infallible *by nature;* but He may by a special providence protect those from error whom He has charged to teach in His name, so that their teaching will never deviate in anything from the truth. Now God has granted this infallibility to His Church; and we shall even prove that He had needs grant her this privilege. In speaking thus we evidently have in view the ordinary course of things, for God could have employed another means, as He did in the Old Law, by sending prophets.

[1] Lacordaire, conf. 6 on the Church (her coercive power).

[2] See references p. 310; also Lyons; Knox; Rivington, Authority; Br. W. v. 280, 389, vi. 324, 429 ff., 453 ff.; and generally works written by converts in defence of their return.

First Thesis.—The Authority Divinely Established to Teach Men the Doctrine of Jesus Christ must be Infallible in its Teaching.

First Argument, drawn from the Mission of the Church and the Necessity of Divine Faith.—This may be stated in various ways.

a. All men, to be saved, are obliged to believe the doctrine taught by Jesus Christ. Now Christ has given His Church the mission and power to teach His doctrine and transmit it from age to age *pure and intact;* therefore, unless Christ intervenes with continual miracles to insure the purity of this teaching, He must necessarily guard the teaching Church from all error; in other words, endow her with doctrinal infallibility.

b. The Church, in the name of God, *rigorously commands us to believe,* with a faith resting upon divine authority and excluding all doubt, whatever she offers for our belief, even mysteries most impenetrable to reason. Now the Church has no right to require of men divine faith in her teachings if she is not infallible. No one, in fact, can force reason to admit without reserve a proposition which is not certain. What is only probable evidently cannot command complete and absolute faith; hence as long as error is possible doubt is reasonable. Without the infallibility of the Church divine faith, firm, unwavering faith, is therefore impossible; and without it the Christian religion itself must disappear.

c. Let us state this argument in more general terms. When there is question of religious truth necessary to salvation, human reason imperiously claims *absolutely certain* teaching. Not only do the unlettered feel the need of such teaching, but scholars as well, despite their profound researches and sincere efforts in search of truth. Now if there were no infallible teachers of religion, mankind would find itself abandoned to all the chances of error; it would fluctuate in uncertainty in regard to all that is most essential to its peace and happiness.

d. The same conclusion follows if we apply this reasoning to the preaching of the Gospel among *infidel nations*. Without infallibility the propagation of the Gospel would have been impossible, and consequently Catholicity would not have been a property or distinctive mark of the true Church. The Church sends missionaries everywhere with the mission to convert nations to the true faith. Now if such missionaries do not teach in the name of an infallible authority, these nations would have a right to say that their doctrine had probably been altered in its passage through the ages. How could they reasonably be required to accept with full and entire faith that which might prove to be only error? What difference would there be between such preaching and that of Protestant ministers who cannot command belief in their doctrine in the name of God?[1]

Second Argument, drawn from the Necessity of Unity of Doctrine or Belief.—Controversy concerning questions of faith and morals will necessarily arise in the Church. The history of heresy shows us that such controversies have sprung up at every period. How could they be settled if there were no infallible authority to pronounce upon them? Without this infallibility the Church's decision could not end the controversy, and unity of doctrine or belief would be impossible.

Second Thesis.—Jesus Christ Established in His Church an Authority Infallible in its Dogmatic and Moral Teaching.

When Jesus Christ sent His apostles into the whole world to call immortal souls to the truth and to salvation, He said to them: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth; going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to

[1] Lacordaire, conf. 3 on the Church.

the consummation of the world" (Matth. xxviii. 18 ff.). "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you" (John xx. 21). "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi. 15 f.) "And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth: . . . He shall abide with you, and shall be in you" (John xiv. 16 f.). "But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth" (John xvi. 13). "But when the Paraclete cometh whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall give testimony of Me: and you shall give testimony, because you are with Me from the beginning" (John xv. 26 f.). "You are the salt of the earth; . . . you are the light of the world" (Matth. v. 13, 14). "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me" (Luke x. 16). "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican. Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." (Matth. xviii. 17 f.)

Evidently Jesus Christ has established a *perfect solidarity* between Himself and those whom He charged to teach the world the truths of salvation. In the most solemn manner He promises them His special assistance in the office of teaching imposed upon them, and He tells them that this assistance shall last *to the end of time*, assuring it thus in equal manner to their legitimate successors. For the preaching of religion, absolutely proof against all error, is as necessary for the coming generations as it has been for those of the past.

It seems unnecessary to appeal to *tradition*. Protestants, our adversaries in the present question, are forced to acknowledge that from the fifth to the sixteenth century the Fathers and theologians have constantly professed the Catholic dogma of infallibility. From which fact we may con-

clude that it was also the doctrine of the first four centuries; for so important a change could never have taken place without exciting formidable opposition from the bishops and the faithful, and particularly from heretics.[1] Moreover, what has always been the tradition of the Church on this subject is clearly seen from the whole history of the Church, especially from the great veneration in which the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils have always been held, a veneration that extends to the very text of the first four General Councils.

II. Object of Infallibility.

The doctrinal authority of the Church is not unlimited; it is, on the contrary, clearly limited to the domain of divine revelation. It relates only to the deposit of revealed doctrine and that which is necessary for the preservation of this deposit. These same boundaries limit infallibility.

Its object includes, then:

1st. The teaching of dogma, or the truths of faith which are to be believed.

2d. Moral teaching, or truths to be practised.

3d. Matters relating to general discipline, in as far as they pertain to faith and morals.

4th. Dogmatic facts, that is to say, facts so intimately connected with dogma, that they cannot be questioned without weakening the dogma itself. Such, for example, are the declarations and verifications of errors contained in the writings judged by the Church, since otherwise she could not, as she is bound to do, preserve from the poison of error the flock confided to her care.

Remarks.—1st. Infallibility comes neither from inspiration properly speaking (p. 54) nor from a new revelation, but from a special, divine assistance granted either to the

[1] Such opposition and controversy would be undoubtedly recorded on the pages of the history of those times. Yet that history is absolutely silent.—Editor.

bishops united with the Pope, or to the supreme pastor, to enable them to understand and proclaim the revelation made by Jesus Christ.[1] This assistance by no means dispenses with useful researches and discussions; in a word, with the labor of man. Only after taking every indispensable means to avoid acting precipitately, only after studying with extreme care the two sources of revelation, Scripture and tradition, does the Church or the Pope declare as revealed a belief hitherto implicitly contained in the deposit of revelation.

2d. Infallibility differs essentially from impeccability, which consists in the inability to sin; this signal privilege, which was awarded to the Mother of God, has never been attributed to the sovereign Pontiff.

III. Subject of Infallibility.

A. Infallibility of the Teaching Church.—To say that the teaching Church is infallible is to say that her body of pastors, united with the Pope, the supreme head of the Church, is infallible, whether assembled in solemn session of an Ecumenical Council or dispersed throughout the world.

To be ecumenical or general, a Council must be convened or approved as such by the Pope, to whom belongs the right to preside over it either personally or by his delegates. Though convened by the Pope or with his approbation, if the head of the Church separate from it, the Council becomes a headless assembly and can do nothing; if it persists in its work, it is then only a conventicle or meeting of dissenters.

B. Infallibility of the Pope.[2]—When he speaks as head of the Church with the fulness of his doctrinal

[1] Br. W. vi. 465 f.

[2] See references p. 373; also Knox; Fessler; Botalla; Manning, Petri Privilegium; Story of the Vatican Council: M. lxviii. 338; Br. W. xiii. 412, and, in general, works on the Vatican Council.

authority the sovereign Pontiff possesses in *himself alone* the same infallibility as the whole teaching Church or the entire episcopal body. Such is the certain belief of the Church at all times, and which has become an article of Catholic faith since the definition of the Vatican Council. Here are the terms of this definition:

"We teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra* —that is, when in the discharge of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church—is, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church.

"If any one should have the rashness to contradict our definition, which God forbid, let him be anathema."

Thesis.—When He Speaks as Head of the Church, with Plenary Doctrinal Authority, the Sovereign Pontiff is Invested with Infallibility.

First Argument, drawn from the Holy Scripture.—*a.* "I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matth. xvi. 18). It results from these words that the Pope, one of whose *essential functions* is to teach the truths revealed by Jesus Christ, is necessarily infallible. On him, in fact, does the Church rest as upon her visible foundation; from him does she derive her stability. Now the stability of a religious society depends above all things on unity of faith. How could this constant and perpetual

unity be possible if Peter, the foundation of the spiritual edifice, could be mistaken in the truths which he requires the faithful to believe? If the Pope by his teaching could lead the faithful into error, the Evil One, the father of lies and of error, would prevail against the Church and against its head.

b. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee that thy faith shall not fail, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 31, 32). Through this prayer, offered for Peter, the future head of the Church and its perpetual foundation, and consequently for his successors, Jesus Christ promises that their faith shall remain invulnerable, and that through them the other members of the Church shall be preserved firm in the faith, despite the trials to which they may be subjected. Now this is not possible except on condition that the Pope be infallible in matters of faith. In fact, if Peter and his successors are not infallible, it must be said either that the prayer of Jesus Christ was not heard, which would be blasphemous, or that Christ, in charging Peter to confirm his brethren in the faith, did not give him the means of fulfilling this essential office, which would be equally insulting to the divine Wisdom.

c. "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep" (John xxi. 15). These words, addressed to Peter alone, confer upon him the mission of feeding the lambs and the sheep, that is, the faithful and those who are their spiritual fathers, hence all the members of the Church in general. Now the food of souls is truth; if Peter is not infallible, if he cannot discern with certainty between the true and the false in matters of faith, he would corrupt with the poison of error the flock confided to him, he would lead them to perdition.

Let us remark that if the decisions of the Pope could be reformed, as the Gallicans desired, it would be the flock who would lead and feed the pastor, who would confirm their

guide in the faith, which is diametrically contrary to the will of the divine Master.

SECOND ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM TRADITION.—If Scripture is clear on the present question, tradition is no less explicit. A great number of texts from the holy Fathers and from the Councils may be found in the books referred to above, p. 373, especially in Manning, Privil. Petri, pt. ii., Botalla, and Alnatt, Cathedra Petri.

Let us note only this fact, decisive in itself, that at all times the sovereign Pontiffs have used their prerogative in condemning heresies throughout the world by the authority proper to them, and without convoking General Councils, and that their decisions have been received as infallible by the entire Church. It is well known that the significant and oft-repeated "Roma locuta, causa finita"—Rome has spoken, the cause is decided—dates from St. Augustine. Before him St. Ambrose uttered these words, which have passed into an axiom: "Where Peter is, there is the Church"—*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*

REMARK.—This definition put a stop to the errors of Gallicanism. Let us say a word of the circumstances which gave rise to that system. Louis XIV. having quarrelled with Rome, and desiring to humble Pope Innocent XI., convoked an assembly of prelates and deputies of the French clergy, in which Bossuet drew up the famous "Declaration of the Gallican Clergy," together with the four Gallican Articles, the last of which was as follows: "Though the Pope has the principal part in questions of faith, and his decrees relate to all churches, and to each one in particular, his judgment is not irreformable, unless by the consent (express or tacit) of the Church." This article had never any doctrinal value. In fact only thirty-four of the one hundred and thirty-five prelates signed the declaration. The others either refused their assent or resisted it with vigorous and irresistible logic. That same year, 1682, it was solemnly disapproved by Pope Innocent

XI., who abolished and annulled all the acts of that assembly. In 1690 it was again and more expressly condemned by Alexander VIII., and in 1794 by Pius VI. Moreover, the bishops who signed the declaration disavowed it, and Bossuet ceased to defend it. Louis XIV. submitted in his turn by suspending the execution of the new ecclesiastical laws. This, however, did not stifle Gallican error; it rose again with a certain violence at the time of the Vatican Council, in which, however, it received its death-blow.[1] After the definition all, anti-infallibilists and inopportunists, with a few rare exceptions, accepted the decree with complete submission, giving to the world again, as often before, a grand sight of the wonderful strength and indestructible unity of the Catholic Church.

If it be asked how Gallicanism could avail against a truth so solidly founded and universally admitted, we answer, political motives may blind the finest minds; moreover, the Gallicans unconsciously adopted a false and absolutely *impossible* hypothesis.[2] They supposed the Pope speaking on his side, and the entire Church holding a contrary opinion; and they could not understand that the decision of the Pope alone should prevail against the opinion of all. But this was an untenable supposition, for the definition of the supreme head of the Church can be only *the expression of the unbroken belief of the Church.* We know, for example, that when there was question of defining the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the universal Church, consulted

[1] On *Gallicanism* see Hergenröther Catholic Church and Christian State; Anti-Janus; Manning, Petri Privilegium, pt. i., p. 40 ff.; pt. ii., p. 107 ff.; Chatard, Essay 1; Botalla, Supremacy, p. 159; Infallibility, p. 342; Parsons, IV., ch. 10; Br. W. x. 471, xi. 62, 252, xiii. 462; D. R. New Ser. xiii., xxii.

[2] The same impossible hypothesis dictated the famous decrees of the Synod of Constance (1416–1418), placing the general council (representing the *whole* Church) above the Pope, as if the mystic body of Christ, the Church, could be *whole* while separated, divided, or standing apart from its divinely appointed head, the Pope.—Editor.

in reference to its belief on this subject, answered by the voice of all its pastors that it believed the Mother of God to be immaculate. One bishop alone dissented, but as soon as the dogma was proclaimed he hastened to proclaim his acceptance of it.

IV. Conditions of Infallibility.

We have seen, in speaking on the subject of infallibility, what is required to make a Council ecumenical and consequently infallible. It now remains for us to say *under what circumstances* the Pope is infallible, that is, when we can be certain that his teaching is free from error. To know this we have only to examine the terms of the decision of the Council of 1870.

According to the Council the Pope, to speak *ex cathedra*, must first act in virtue of his supreme authority and as head of the Church. Second, he must have the intention of defining a doctrine, an intention which must be evident either from the terms he employs (for example, if he uses the words *we define*, if he pronounces anathema against contrary doctrine) or from the circumstances under which he speaks.

In a word, the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* when he makes known his intention to oblige the faithful to believe interiorly and to profess exteriorly that which he teaches concerning faith and morals.

Hence it follows that this character of infallibility extends in no way to the writings and acts of the Pope as a private man. Such are, at least generally speaking, the sovereign Pontiff's allocutions and addresses to the deputations which he receives, as well as briefs which he addresses to individuals; though always worthy of profound respect, these documents do not constitute a definition.

Let us remark further that infallibility embraces only the definition, and not the considerations, or the biblical, philosophical, and historical arguments which usually precede doctrinal definitions.

ART. IV.—RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.[1]

The Church has received from Jesus Christ all the powers necessary to attain her end, and all men who desire to be saved must obey her laws. On the other hand, man, a social being, naturally forms part of a civil society, which has also received from God the powers necessary to attain its proper end, and justly requires obedience to its laws. It is important to know what relations God wills should exist between these two societies composed of the same members; in other words, to know the reciprocal rights and duties of the Church and the State.

Leo XIII. in his admirable encyclical on Christian States presents these relations very clearly. Let us quote a few passages from it, and then sum up this doctrine in a few theses, which will help to fix in our minds the ideas relative to this important question. It is particularly necessary to do so at the present day, when efforts are made to hamper the Church in the exercise of her authority and make her subordinate to temporal powers.

"God has divided the government of mankind between two powers, ecclesiastical and civil; one presides over divine things, the other over human. Each in its sphere is sovereign; each is marked with limits perfectly defined, and traced in conformity with its nature and its special end. Hence there is, as it were, a circumscribed sphere, in which each exercises its action *jure proprio*. At the same time, their authority being exercised on the same subjects, it may

[1] Allies, Church and State; Earnshaw, Molitor, Sweeney, O'Reilly; Manning, Newman, and others against Gladstone; Manning, Miscell., vol. ii., n. 4, 5, 6; Vat. Decr., ch. 2, 3; Hergenröther, Church and State, vol. i., Essay 1; vol. ii., Essays 13, 14, 15; Manning, Essays, in I. and II. Ser. (Lucas); A. C. Q. ii. 430, xvi. 20; C. W. xxvii. 111, liv. 389; M. xliv. 457; D. R. New Ser. xxiv. 170, 454, xxvi. 351, xxix. 308, xxx. 174; Br. W. vii. 554, x., xi., xiii. often; Lacordaire, conf. 5 on the Church; The Yorke-Wendke Controversy, p. ii.

happen that one and the same thing, though for different reasons, may come under the jurisdiction and judgment of both powers; . . . hence the necessity of having between the two powers a system of well-ordered relations, analogous to that which in man constitutes the union of soul and body. We can form a just idea of the nature and power of these relations only by considering the nature of each of these two powers and by bearing in mind the excellence and nobility of their ends, since the special and immediate end of one is the promotion of temporal interests, and of the other, spiritual and eternal interests. Thus all that is sacred in human things in any respect whatever, all that relates to the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either through its nature or through the relation of its end, comes under the authority of the Church. As to other things which relate to the civil and political order, it is just that they be subject to civil authority, for Christ has commanded us to 'render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.' "

Leo XIII. in his encyclical on Civil Government has also said: The Church "recognizes and declares that all belonging to the civil order are under their (*i.e.* temporal rulers) power and supreme authority. In things the judgment of which, for various reasons, belongs to the religious and to the civil power, she wishes that there be mutual accord, by which blessed means both powers will be preserved from fatal dissensions."

First Thesis.—The Ecclesiastical Power and the Civil Power, Church and State, are Independent or Sovereign, each Within the Limits of its Proper Sphere of Action.

I. Independence of the Spiritual Power.

First Argument.—This is clearly evident from *the divine will.* To Peter and his successors Christ confided the government of His Church. "To her, and not to the

State," says Leo XIII. in the encyclical on Christian States, "belongs the right to guide men in heavenly things. To her has God given the command to make known and to decide all things relating to religion, to teach all nations, to extend as far as possible the frontiers of Christianity, in a word, to administer freely, and according to her own judgment, Christian interests." It is evident that to subject the Church to a power other than that which God has established would be to overthrow the personal work of God.

SECOND ARGUMENT, FROM THE SUPERIOR END OF THE CHURCH.—The direct end of civil society is to promote the welfare and safety of man here below, to further the preservation and development of his nature in the physical and intellectual order. The special end of religious society or of the Church is to help him to attain perfect and eternal happiness, to establish and extend the reign of God upon earth, to labor for the moral and supernatural perfection of man, to lead him to his supreme destiny, to insure him boundless happiness, which consists in the eternal possession of God. This evidently is a mission superior to that which is proper to the civil power. "As the end of the Church is by far the noblest of all," says Leo XIII., "her power should rank above all others, and cannot in any way be inferior or subject to any civil power."

THIRD ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE NATURE, THE OBJECTS, AND THE EXTENT OF THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY.—*a.* A power directly divine, universal, perpetual, and immutable in its origin is infinitely superior to that which is only indirectly divine, which is variable, and limited by time and space. Now spiritual power *was established directly and immediately by God Himself;* moreover, it is universal and perpetual, and is founded upon divine and immutable laws. The authority of civil rulers, it is true, also comes from God: "There is no power but from God" (Rom. xiii. 1). But in religious society, everything depends directly upon Him; not only spiritual authority itself, but also its form, its limits,

and the manner of exercising it, rest upon a positive divine right; the community possesses and transmits no power. In civil society, on the contrary, the form of government and the conditions of sovereignty are of positive human right; they depend on the free choice of men, and consequently are subject to change. *b.* The *objects* and *means* of this spiritual power are all of a sacred and supernatural character: the word of God, sacrifice, sacraments and worship, Christian virtue and sanctification. On the other hand, the civil power is confined exclusively to objects and means of the natural order. *c.* Finally, in regard to the *extent of their jurisdiction,* the Church is essentially *universal* and *perpetual;* it must carry its mission to all nations, to the end of time. The civil power, on the contrary, is essentially national, circumscribed by geographical limits, natural or conventional, and has, moreover, only a limited and uncertain duration.

Fourth Argument, from the Conduct of Christ and His Apostles.—Nowhere do we find Jesus asking permission of earthly rulers to preach, to assemble His apostles, to establish His Church. Nor do we find that He commanded His apostles to take counsel with civil governments in order to propagate the Gospel and exercise their ministry. He predicted, on the contrary, that they would be cruelly treated and persecuted by earthly rulers and magistrates because of their mission. If He commanded them to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, that is, to submit to him in matters purely temporal, if He Himself gave an example of this submission by paying the tribute, they have not to consult civil authorities in matters belonging to spiritual government. Thus we find the apostles announcing the good tidings everywhere, founding churches, consecrating bishops, ordaining priests and deacons, making disciplinary laws and precepts, regardless of the temporal powers; when driven from one place they go to another; if they are overwhelmed with outrages and insults, they glory to suffer for

the name of Jesus. They cannot, they say, be silent concerning that which they have seen and heard, and they must "obey God rather than men."

The Acts of the Apostles offer us a remarkable example of this independence of the spiritual power. The Jewish magistrates forbade the apostles to teach the doctrine of Jesus, alleging that they disturbed the public peace. What do the apostles reply? "We must obey God rather than men." Here we have on the one hand the Church commanding the preaching of the Gospel in order to fulfil its end, the salvation of souls, a thing of spiritual interest; on the other, the magistrates forbidding this same preaching, in view of the public peace, a matter of temporal interest. Now the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of Peter, commanded them to disregard this prohibition. The apostle does not say that public order shall not be disturbed; he only alleges the will of God (iv. 19; v. 29).

Fifth Argument, from Ecclesiastical History.—The example of the apostles has been faithfully imitated by their successors, not only through long periods of persecution, but throughout all history. "This authority, perfect in itself and absolutely independent, the Church has never ceased to claim or to exercise publicly. . . . Moreover, it has, in principle and in fact, been acknowledged by princes and heads of government, who in their negotiations and transactions, by sending and receiving ambassadors, and by the exchange of other good offices, have constantly acted with the Church as with a sovereign and legitimate power. Thus it was by a special providence of God that this authority was furnished with a civil principality as the best safeguard of its independence." (Leo XIII. on Christian States.)

Remark.—There is nothing in common between the superiority of the Church's jurisdiction, of which we have just spoken, and theocracy, with which writers sometimes affect to confound it. *Theocracy*, which is the *government of a temporal society by a political law divinely revealed, and by*

an authority supernaturally constituted, has never existed except among the Jewish people, and only during a period of their history. It is true that by theocracy is sometimes meant the domination which many attribute to the clergy in purely temporal matters. But the Catholic doctrine, in proclaiming, as we shall see, the independence of civil power in these matters, renders such domination impossible.

II. Independence of the Civil Power.

As long as it does not violate the laws of God and the rights of the Church, as long as the spiritual interests and the supreme end of man are not endangered, the State is free to take whatever measures it pleases in regard to customs, imposts, finances, armies, public works, etc. The Church has nothing to do with these purely human details, relating only to the temporal happiness of nations. In other words, the Church has not and does not claim, in virtue of its institution, any power over civil society in purely temporal matters relating to a temporal end or an exclusively temporal interest. "The civil order," says the present Pope, speaking of temporal rulers, "is entirely subject to their power and to their sovereign authority."[1]

Corollaries.—1st. It follows from the preceding thesis that there exists between Church and State *a real distinction* decreed by Jesus Christ. Let us observe, however, that this distinction is not *rigidly essential.* In fact God could have confided to the same authority the office of promoting at the same time the spiritual and the temporal end of man. He could have made the kings of the earth the ministers of the head of the Church, receiving their power from him and governing in his name. But He has not willed to do this. Christ in reality has ordained that each of these two ends

[1] See Rickaby, Essay I.: Moral Philosophy ch. 8; Balmes; Civilization, ch. 49 ff.

should be promoted by a special authority, each, in its proper sphere of action, independent of the other.

2d. From what we have stated of the powers conferred by Christ upon His Church, and the independence in regard to civil authority which He has guaranteed to her, it results, in virtue of the definition itself previously given, that the Church is truly a *perfect* society. It also follows that pagan Cæsarism and all encroachments of the civil power upon the religious related in the history of the Church must be condemned.

III. Rights of the Church.

It will not be beside our purpose to enumerate here a few of the rights which the Church justly claims. To rob her of these rights is to violate the independence which belongs to her as a perfect society, possessing in herself, according to the sovereign order of Jesus Christ, her Founder, all the means necessary to attain her end.

A. The Church has the right to fulfil the mission and exercise the power she has received from her divine Founder without having to ask the authority of the civil power, and without being subject to its control or its interference. Thus she is absolutely independent in everything relating to the teaching of dogma and of morals, the administration of the sacraments, the election of her pontiffs, the erection and direction of her seminaries and religious communities, the distribution of ecclesiastical offices. No one has the right to prevent the sovereign Pontiff from communicating with the clergy and the faithful, or to prevent the promulgation of his briefs or the execution of his decrees; the royal *placet* and *exequatur* with which civil authority sometimes claims to control the acts of the spiritual power are illicit and of no value unless they are the result of a *concordat*,[1] that is, of a concession of ecclesiastical authority.

[1] Hunter, vol. i., n. 303; Hergenröther, Church and State, I., p. 71.

B. As each member of the Church is composed of a double nature, of a soul and of a body, he must be led to his final end by means appropriate to this double nature. Hence:

a. The Church has a right to impose upon its members not only purely spiritual but also material things, such as fasting, almsgiving, assistance at divine worship.

b. The Church has the right and the duty to carry on divine worship exteriorly and publicly, and consequently to prescribe public, exterior ceremonies, such as processions, pilgrimages; to require the material means necessary for the exercise of her worship, for the support of her ministers, for the construction and preservation of sacred edifices, and, since material means are necessary for this purpose, to acquire temporal goods, to hold and possess them.

c. The Church has the right to command the obedience of her members, to impose upon the rebellious spiritual or material penalties, either for their amendment or as an example to others.

None of these rights can be taken from the Church without violating the independence which she justly claims as a perfect society, that is, as a society possessing in itself, by the sovereign will of Christ, her Founder, all the means of preservation and of action necessary to attain her end.

Second Thesis.—In Cases of Conflict, that is, when in Mixed Matters the Two Authorities Prescribe Contradictory Obligations for Members Owing Allegiance to Both Powers, the Authority of the Church must Prevail over that of Civil Society.

In temporal matters there arises, sometimes in the ordinary course of things, sometimes through exceptional circumstances, a spiritual interest which the Church must safeguard; at the same time the purpose or object of such interests may not be of a sufficiently supernatural character to place them altogether in the spiritual or supernatural sphere;

hence these are called mixed matters; a case in point is the question of the temporal possessions of the Church.

"All," says Leo XIII., "which in human things is sacred for any reason whatever, all that pertains to the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either in its nature or its end, comes under the authority of the Church." This is the proper domain of the Church, and consequently she has a right to exercise her authority in regard to governments as well as in regard to the individual faithful. Nevertheless history attests that in questions of this nature the Church always tries to act in concert with the State, in order that such matters may be regulated by a common agreement, rather than by a summary and supreme decision on her part. Let us add further the following words of the encyclical already quoted: "At times it may happen that another means of securing harmony and guaranteeing peace and liberty avails; this is when the heads of governments and the sovereign pontiffs have a special agreement upon some special point. Under such circumstances the Church gives striking proof of her motherly charity in carrying indulgence and condescension as far as possible."

The thesis announced is only a logical deduction of what has gone before; nevertheless, because of its importance at the present time, it is well to insist a little further on some of the arguments upon which it rests.

First Argument, drawn from the End itself of the Church.—This end is infinitely superior to that of the State. What, in fact, are temporal goods compared to eternal? What, says Our Saviour, will it profit a man to gain the whole world if he lose his own soul? All earthly possessions, and civil society itself, are only means given by God to man to lead him to his final end, the possession of eternal happiness. The proper and immediate end of the State is to promote the temporal happiness of man; therefore in everything relating to the final end of man it must be subordinate to the Church. "The art of the pilot," says St. Thomas,

"regulates that of the sailor, the art of the architect that of the mason, and the arts of peace those of war."

SECOND ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE SUPERIORITY OF THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY OVER ANY CIVIL POWER.—See Third Argument, p. 412.

THIRD ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM CATHOLIC TRADITION AND PONTIFICAL DECISIONS.—"All the Fathers of the Church," says Tarquini, in his excellent and sound work, *Les principes du droit public de l'Eglise*, "have constantly taught that the end of civil society, and its government, must be subordinate to the Church, as the body is to the soul." The same thing is affirmed by the decisions of the Holy See. Not only did Pius IX. condemn the 42d Proposition of the Syllabus thus formulated: "In cases of conflict between the two powers the civil power prevails," but in his Encyclical *Quanta Cura* Pius IX., basing his decision upon the words of several of his predecessors, expressed himself in these terms: "It is certain that it is the interest of rulers, whenever there is question of the affairs of God, carefully to follow the order which He has prescribed, and to yield, and not to prefer the royal will to that of the priests of Christ."

Third Thesis.—The Church and the State should Mutually Help Each Other.

The conflicts of which we have just spoken are extremely to be regretted; they are injurious to the good of the Church, as well as to that of the State. Hence there should be between the two powers, as Leo XIII. says, "well-ordered relations, analogous to those which constitute in man the union of body and soul." The wise providence of God, which has established both powers, has provided for their needs by tracing the relations that should exist between them. These relations will form the subject of the present thesis.

IV. The Church Should Aid and Protect the State.

This duty, which does not need to be demonstrated, the Church does not dispute; she fulfils it by her teaching concerning the divine origin of temporal power, and the necessity of obedience to all lawful authority; by her prayers, her sacraments, and her worship, which help subjects to fulfil their civil obligations. The Church is even obliged, when necessary, to resort to spiritual penalties to induce her subjects to perform their duty toward the State. There may be even circumstances when it will be her duty to help the State by pecuniary sacrifices, by relinquishing some of her possessions, etc.

V. The Temporal Power Owes Assistance to the Church.

1st. Indirectly. *a*. By causing justice, order, and tranquillity to reign in the State, in order that the Church may be able to exercise efficaciously her salutary influence.

b. By refraining from violating the rights of the Church, and never permitting her to be hampered in any way in the fulfilment of her divine mission, in the preaching of the Gospel, in the exercise of her worship, in the administration of the sacraments and in her government.

2d. Directly. The State owes the Church positive and direct assistance, without, however, going outside its proper sphere. Its duty, for example, is to make laws in harmony with the divine and ecclesiastical laws; to sanction, as far as circumstances require and permit, the laws of the Church, by temporal penalties; to provide, if necessary, for the maintenance of the ministers of religion, and religious worship itself. Let us give a few proofs of this direct duty, which is usually contested.

First Argument, drawn from the Designs of God Himself.—God's special design, together with His glory, is the *eter-*

nal happiness of man. If He delegates a part of His authority, it is in the interest of this supreme end. It was to procure man this happiness that He sent His Son upon earth, that He established His Church, that He wills its extension and its freedom. If the heads of government receive a portion of this divine authority, if they can exact obedience in the name of God, it is, no doubt, that they may secure peace and temporal prosperity, but they must make these blessings all contribute to the final end of their subjects. The latter, moreover, cannot seek and desire the things of this world, except in as far as they serve to realize their eternal destiny. Hence depositaries of civil power use it lawfully only when it serves to promote this same end. They also must labor as far as circumstances permit, and in the limits of their sphere, for the progress of the true religion, the only religion which leads souls to salvation.

SECOND ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE SOCIAL ROYALTY OF JESUS CHRIST.—Jesus Christ is God, and as His absolute sovereignty over all that exists is a necessary attribute of His divinity, He is King of civil societies, as well as of families and individuals. This royalty is clearly proclaimed in the Old as well as in the New Testament. "Let peoples serve Thee and tribes worship Thee," said Isaac, prophetically addressing the Messias (Gen. xxvii.). "All the kings of the earth shall adore Him," says David, "all nations shall serve Him" (Psalms lxxi.). "Kings shall be His ministers" (Isaias lx.). "God has given to the Son of man power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes, and tongues shall serve Him" (Daniel vii.). "God," says St. Paul, "hath exalted Him, and hath given Him a name which is above every name: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth" (Philip. ii. 9). "God has subjected all things under His feet; . . . He hath left nothing not subject to Him" (Hebrews ii. 8). He is "King of kings and Lord of lords" (Apoc. xix. 16). We know, moreover, the categorical

affirmation of Our Saviour Himself: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth." "All things have been given to Me by the Father." In virtue of the authority which essentially belongs to Him as God, Jesus Christ could have assumed the temporal as well as the spiritual sceptre of the entire world. He has not done so; it has pleased Him to leave to earthly rulers power over purely human things. But if His kingdom is not of this world, if He commands us to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, He cannot permit that we render not to God what is God's. He has made His religion binding not only upon man individually, but upon societies; nations as well as individuals must obey the law of the Gospel, and the depositaries of civil power are bound to see, as far as it is in their power, that His sovereign will is carried out.

THIRD ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE WELFARE OF THE STATE ITSELF.—The prosperity of the State, the realization of its proper and immediate end, that is, the temporal happiness that it must procure its members, require that it contribute, as far as it may, to the prosperity of the Church. In fact without religion, no public, stable, and prosperous society is possible. Religion is the basis of society, for it explains the origin of society, the lawfulness of social power, gives a solid foundation to obedience, and causes harmony, justice, and charity to reign among citizens. Evidently the true religion, that which contains all truth unmixed with error, which renders to God the worship due Him, and gives man supernatural strength to fulfil his duties, is, by this fact itself, the strongest support of the State, and a powerful aid in the attainment of its proper end.

FOURTH ARGUMENT, DRAWN FROM THE FORMAL AND EXPLICIT DECLARATION OF THE CHURCH.—See, for example, the Encyclical of Gregory XVI. in 1832, of Pius IX. in 1846, and the Propositions 55, 77, and 78 of the Syllabus. But let us hear particularly what is said upon this subject by the Pontiff gloriously reigning: "Political societies cannot, without crime,

conduct themselves as though God existed not at all, or dispense with religion as something foreign and useless, or indifferently admit any religion according to their good pleasure. In honoring the Divinity they must follow strictly the rules and the mode of worship by which God declared that He wished to be honored. The heads of the State must, therefore, hold the name of God as holy, and rank among their principal obligations the duty of protecting and favoring religion, of supporting it with the tutelary authority of the laws, and of avoiding any statutes or decisions contrary to its safety and integrity. . . . Civil society should, in favoring public prosperity, provide for the welfare of the citizens in such a way as not only to place no obstacle to religion, but to afford every possible facility for the pursuit and attainment of that supreme and unchangeable good to which they aspire. . . . For public power was established for the benefit of the governed, and though its immediate end is to promote the temporal prosperity of citizens, it is the duty of rulers not to diminish but, on the contrary, to increase man's facilities for attaining that supreme and sovereign good in which eternal happiness consists and which is impossible without religion." (Encycl. already quoted.)

Remark.—We have just stated, taking as guide the encyclical *Immortale Dei* (on Christian States), the Catholic doctrine in regard to the relations which should exist between Church and State. In this statement we have reasoned from an absolute thesis, without taking into consideration circumstances which, at the present day particularly, modify these relations in the interest itself of both societies. We shall speak later (p. 442 ff.) of these modifications, and we shall explain when and why a Catholic may accept a constitution which deviates from these general principles, swear allegiance to it, and even defend it at need.

ART. V.—ON LIBERALISM AND LIBERTY.

I. Notions concerning Liberalism.[1]

There is a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of the Catholic Church regarding her powers and rights and her relations to the State. It bears falsely the name of Liberalism.[2]

[1] Pius IX., Syllabus of 1864; Leo XIII., Encyclicals on Socialism, etc., 1878, Matrimony, 1880, Civil Government, 1881, Freemasonry, 1884, 1892, Christian States, 1885, Human Liberty, 1888, Christian Citizenship, 1890; Apostolic Letters to the Emperor of Brazil, 1889, to the Bishops of Italy, 1890, of France, 1892, of Hungary, 1893; Pallen, What is Liberalism?; Brownson, L bera ism and the Church; Br. W. vii. 305; D. R. New Ser. xviii. 1, 285, xxv. 202, xxvi. 204, 487, III. Ser. xv. 58.

[2] It is important, above all things not to confound Liberalism as it existed for a certain period with the Liberalism of the present day, for one differs essentially from the other. Only the name has been retained, the more easily to deceive unthinking minds.

Formerly Liberalism meant a system, or rather a politica' tendency, opposed to Centralism or Absolutism, favoring in a great measure the participation of the citizens in the government of the State, and procuring, particularly, a large autonomy of individuals and families, of private associations communities, and provinces in the administration of their own interests. It was, in other terms, a tendency favorable to politica and to social liberty. In this acceptation of the term it is evident that Catholics would be excellent Liberals, or rather that they alone, at the present day, would have the right to bear the name. Catholics are in fact wholly favorable to political and civil liberty as we shall describe it elsewhere. They particularly claim for each one, in the reasonable limits of natu al law, freedom to dispose of his person, of his acts, to embrace the life or the profession he pleases, to form associations for an honest purpose, to dispose of his fortune during his life and decree by will the disposition to be made of it after his death according to the inspiration of his conscience, and without interference on the part of the civil power. Catholics desire no less the independence of their country, and freedom to govern according to its own laws. If they live under a government which admits modern liberties, they respect the government constituted to meet the present needs of society, and if they complain, it is only when unjust restrictions violate the

We say falsely, because it is far from teaching and upholding true liberty. It is not easy to give a precise and full definition of liberalism, for the simple reason that it is really a purely negative system, something like Protestantism, and, like this, susceptible of numerous shades. We shall distinguish three classes of liberals, to which others can easily be assigned.

A. Radicals, or Radical Liberals.—They are rightly so called, because by removing every religious restraint they strike at the very roots and foundations of the social order. Of these Pope Leo XIII. says, in his famous encyclical on Human Liberty: "The partisans of naturalism and of rationalism are in philosophy what the abettors of liberalism are in the moral and civil order, since they introduce into morals and practical life the principles laid down by the partisans of naturalism. According to them, in practical life there is no divine power which they are bound to obey, but each one is a law unto himself. This gives rise to that *morality* called *independent* and which, under an appearance of liberty, turns the will from the observance of the divine precepts and leads man to unlimited license."[1]

Critique.—1st. Between the Catholic Church and radical liberalism, which is really identical with naturalism and free thought, there is evidently positive and complete opposition. We do not need to refute it; we have already done so in demonstrating the existence of a religion revealed by God, and how all men are obliged to embrace

liberty of citizens and the rights made sacred by the Constitution of their country.—Author.

Besides this *Political Liberalism* there is a system of political economy sometimes called *Economic Liberalism* (see Devas, Polit. Economy, p. 552). Both systems are to a certain extent represented by the famous Liberal Party of England. Our treatise has nothing to do with either system, being concerned exclusively with *Liberalism in Religion*.—Editor.

[1] Mingr. Data of Modern Ethics, ch. 10, 11; Lilly, Right and Wrong.

the Catholic faith under pain of failing to attain the end for which they were created.

2d. It is not difficult to see the *inevitable* and *disastrous effects* of such a doctrine. It is of the greatest possible injury to the individual as well as to society. The Holy Father demonstrates this with great clearness and convincing logic: "To desire that there be no tie between man or civil society and God, the Creator and, consequently, the supreme Legislator of all things, is contrary to nature; . . . to make good and evil dependent upon the judgment of human reason alone, is to suppress the proper distinction between good and evil; there will be no longer any real difference between what is wrong and what is right, save in the opinion and judgment of the individual; whatsoever pleases him becomes lawful. Once we admit such moral doctrine, which is powerless to subdue or appease the disorderly movements of the soul, we open the way to all the corruptions of life. . . . Once we repudiate the power of God over man and over human society, it is natural that society should no longer have any religion, and that everything relating to religion should become to it a matter of complete indifference. Armed with the idea of its sovereignty, the multitude will be easily led into sedition and revolt, and, the curb of duty and of conscience no longer existing, force will be the only resource—force, which is of little avail by itself to restrain the passions of the populace. We have a proof of this in the almost daily warfare waged against socialistic and other seditious sects which have been trying so long to destroy the State to its very foundation. Let, then, impartial minds judge and decide whether such doctrines are conducive to true liberty and are worthy of man, or whether they are not rather the ruin and complete destruction of society." (Encycl. cit.)

B. There is another kind of Liberals, called by Leo XIII. *Social* or *State Liberals*. They do not formally deny all dependence of man upon God; they are satisfied to affirm the absolute independence of civil society *as a society*. Ac-

cording to them, the divine laws must regulate the life and conduct of individuals, but not that of *governments* or *states*. They would have it lawful in public things to deviate from the commands of God, and to legislate without any regard to them; the pernicious consequence of this is the *Separation of Church and State* and the axiom of *No Religion in Politics*.[1]

This milder Liberalism may be defined as the doctrine which claims for civil society an absolute independence in regard to religion. Or, again, the political school which admits but one sovereign authority, the State, and denies the necessary coexistence, distinction, and harmony of the two powers, temporal and spiritual. It may also be called *social rationalism*. It declares the people as a nation, and civil powers of all degrees, exempt from every obligation, and every duty toward any religious authority whatever. To them Christian revelation, Jesus Christ its Author, the Church which He established and which represents Him on earth, are *as if they did not exist;* they do not even know if Jesus Christ is God. They have not to concern themselves with this question, which belongs, they say, to individuals; the existence of Jesus Christ and of His Church in no way affects the action of the State and its various powers. Thus, for example, when the legislature makes laws, the executive power, and the courts in applying them, have no need to consider whether these laws are or are not conformable to the law of God, to the express will of Jesus Christ, to the rights which He conferred upon His Church. Such liberals allege that though a man as an individual is free to live in private life as a Christian, he is forbidden to act as such *in his public life* and in the exercise of his functions.

Another consequence of these liberal principles is that where the State undertakes the work of instruction or public education its teaching, called *neutral* or *unsectarian*, must

[1] I. E. R., Sep. '94; M. S. H., June 1901; U. B., Jan. '97.

be atheistic, godless, without any religion; for all opinions, they say, must be respected. As to ethics or moral teaching, they are wary, it is true, of committing themselves, and to deceive simple minds they talk of *independent, lay* morality, etc. As if there could be a binding rule of morality without a supreme legislator and adequate sanction. How could it be imposed upon the conscience, deprived as it is of the truths on which it must necessarily rest?

CRITIQUE.—1st. State liberalism, though less impious, no doubt, than radical liberalism, is nevertheless the antithesis of the doctrine which we stated in regard to the relations which should, in principle, exist between the two powers. We have refuted it by establishing our thesis with solid proofs. Hence a faithful child of the Church cannot hesitate upon this point. For it is to be noted that these liberals present their doctrines as absolute truth; according to them it flows from principles of reason, and is consequently applicable to all times and to all places. Here is the judgment formulated by Leo XIII. on this subject: "For such a state of things to exist a civil community must needs have no duty toward God, or be able to disregard it with impunity, which is equally and manifestly false. It is a matter beyond doubt that the union of men in society is the work of the will of God, whether we consider the society in its members, in its form which is authority, in its cause, or in the number and importance of the advantages which it affords man. God made man for society, and to unite him with his fellow beings, in order that the needs of his nature, which his individual efforts could not supply, might find satisfaction in the association. For this reason civil society, as a society, must necessarily recognize God as its Principle and as its Author, and consequently render to His power and to His authority the homage of its worship. Neither in the name of reason nor of justice can the State be atheistic, or adopt a system which would result in atheism, that is, treat all religions alike, and grant them equal rights. Hence,

as it is necessary to profess a religion in society, it must be the one true religion, readily recognized, at least in Catholic countries, by the striking marks of truth which it bears. This religion the heads of the State, therefore, are bound to preserve and protect if they would fulfil their obligation to provide prudently and profitably for the interest of the community. For public power was established for the benefit of the governed; and though its immediate end is to promote the temporal prosperity of citizens, it is the duty of rulers not to diminish but, on the contrary, to increase man's facility for attaining the supreme and sovereign good in which eternal happiness consists, and which is impossible without religion." (Encycl. cit.)

2d. If these State liberals were logical, there would be a fatal outbreak of radicalism, as in fact there has been among those who consistently followed their principles.

In reality radical liberals alone are logical. If God has no authority over man as a social being, i.e., when associated with his fellows in earthly pursuits, why should He have any authority over man in his private life? Has He, perhaps, created man for society in order that he may thus withdraw in part from the sovereign dominion of his Creator? Has He communicated a part of His power to civil authorities in order that they may turn their subjects from the fulfilment of certain duties toward the Divinity? God is either Master of man, everywhere and always, or He is not Master at all. The nihilists of Russia and the anarchists of all countries are only carrying out the logical consequences of these liberal principles. It is true, as the Pope causes us to remark, that the partisans of liberalism do not give complete assent to such doctrines. Alarmed by the enormity of their claims, and appreciating perhaps that they are in opposition with truth, they would have reason remain subject to the natural law and to the divine, eternal law; but they do not admit that a man should submit to laws which it might please God to impose upon him in some other way than by means of

natural reason. The Pope has no difficulty in demonstrating that on this point liberals contradict themselves.

3d. Of the disastrous effects of this liberalism we shall soon see more in the paragraph on "Modern Liberties." Suffice it to say that the work of this system usually goes much farther than its professions. It is not satisfied with affecting indifference toward religion; it is frequently its avowed and positive enemy, as its words and actions prove. Look at what has taken place recently and what is still taking place in countries where liberalism rules. It is not difficult to recognize that the famous separation of Church and State is in reality only the absorption of the Church by the State, or the persecution of the Church by the State. The ideal of liberalism is the old pagan Cæsarism. It means the head of the government, whether one or many, wielding both the material and the spiritual sword, and thus *monopolizing the control of education*, constituting itself the sole teacher of society. Where the laws and the public conscience do not permit it to realize this ideal it approximates as closely as possible to it by administrative measures as perfidious as they are numerous. There is, however, a difference between the present persecution and that of former times: to-day it is universal and the selfsame everywhere, its purpose being the complete destruction of the one true Church of Jesus Christ. The reason of this is that the real source of the persecution is none other than *Freemasonry*, of which liberalism is the willing servant.

C. We must here mention a third kind of liberalism which, under many various forms, has appeared at different periods of the Church's history. It took a more definite and tangible form during the last century and has been called "Catholic Liberalism" or "Liberal Catholicism."[1]

[1] This latter term is used in the celebrated joint Pastoral Letter upon this subject addressed to their flock by the Catholic hierarchy of England, Dec. 29. 1900. It was submitted to the judgment of the Holy Father, who, in turn, sent a most flattering letter to the

It is hardly to be expected that among Catholics living in an atmosphere saturated with the fatal germs of liberalism there will not be a few here and there contaminated by its teaching. It is not unusual, therefore, to find men who, heartily attached to the Church, and with a laudable desire to further what they consider her true interests, will try to effect an impossible compromise or reconciliation between the doctrines of liberalism and those of the Church; they will indulge in baseless dreams of a future when the spiritual and temporal power will be absolutely independent one of the other. They will deem it a prudent policy on the part of the Church to pass over in silence Catholic truths opposed to current errors; to refrain from asserting certain rights which conflict with what are called modern ideas. Hence, without denying the teaching and unerring authority of the Church, they would, nevertheless, that the body of doctrines imposed as of faith upon all men be confined within the smallest possible limits, minimized, while free speculation and discussion of religious as well as philosophic questions must be given the widest range; dogmas already proclaimed must be allowed a wider and more liberal interpretation in accordance with the advance and development of modern ideas and science; the decrees of the Roman Congregations, especially the Holy Office and the Index, ought to be few and far between, lest they become so many stumbling-blocks to Catholic philosophers and scientists. Doctrines offensive and distasteful to non-Catholics should not be too loudly preached from the pulpit, lest these people, instead of joining the fold, turn against the Church. Again, admitting the power of the Church "to bind and to loose," liberal Catholics find much to criticise in the present legislation and discipline

English bishops, praising them for their "timely and prudent exhortation." For, he says, "too well known is the actual and threatening mischief of that body of fallacious opinions which is commonly designated as 'Liberal Catholicism.'" The Pastoral is found in the M. S. H., Feb. 1901.

of the Church restricting individual liberty (religious orders, marriage, rights of the laity, relations with the State, secret societies, communion with the sects, etc.); there is too much "mediævalism" and "ultramontanism" in the Church, which, like a dead weight, keeps her "behind the times."[1]

"The principles on which the new opinions we have mentioned are based may be reduced to this: that in order the more easily to bring over to Catholic doctrine those who dissent from it, the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and, relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern popular theories and methods. Many think that this is to be understood not only with regard to the rule of life, but also to the doctrines in which the *deposit of faith* is contained. For they contend that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those who are not in accord with us, to pass over certain heads of doctrine, as if of lesser moment, or to so soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held. . . . The followers of these novelties judge that a certain liberty ought to be introduced into the Church, so that, limiting the exercise and vigilance of its powers, each one of the faithful may act more freely in pursuance of his own natural bent and capacity. They affirm, namely, that this is called for in order to imitate that liberty which, though quite recently introduced, is now the law and the foundation of almost every civil community."

To the above demands of liberal Catholicism the Pope answers in the same letter as follows: "Few words are needed to show how reprehensible is the plan that is thus conceived, if we but consider the character and origin of the doctrine which the Church hands down to us. On that

[1] This paragraph has been slightly modified by the editor, who has also added the following extracts from the letter of Leo XIII. to Cardinal Gibbons, Jan. 22, 1899. See also Rickaby, Oxf. Conf., s. ii.; Tyrrell, Faith of Mill., I., p. 68; Ward, Geo., Doctr. Auth., Essays 1–4; M. S. H., Feb. 1901; I. E. R., March 1903; M., May 1898.

point the Vatican Council says: 'The doctrine of faith which God has revealed is not proposed like a theory of philosophy which is to be elaborated by the human understanding, but as a divine deposit delivered to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. . . . That sense of the sacred dogmas is to be faithfully kept which Holy Mother Church has once declared, and is not to be departed from under the specious pretext of a more profound understanding.'

"Nor is the suppression to be considered altogether free from blame which designedly omits certain principles of Catholic doctrine and buries them, as it were, in oblivion. For there is the one and the same Author and Master of all the truths that Christian teaching comprises, *the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father.* That they are adapted to all ages and nations is plainly deduced from the words which Christ addressed to His apostles: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.* Wherefore the same Vatican Council says: 'By the divine and Catholic faith those things are to be believed which are contained in the word of God, either written or handed down, and are proposed by the Church, whether in solemn decision or by the ordinary universal magisterium, to be believed as having been divinely revealed.' Far be it, then, from any one to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over anything of this divinely delivered doctrine; whosoever would do so would rather wish to alienate Catholics from the Church than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from it. . . . If anything is suggested by the infallible teaching of the Church, it is certainly that no one should wish to withdraw from it, nay, that all should strive to be thoroughly imbued with and be guided by its spirit, in order to be the more easily preserved from any private error whatsoever. To this we may add that those who argue in that wise quite set aside the wisdom and providence of God; who, when He desired in

that very solemn decision to affirm the authority and teaching office of the Apostolic See, desired it especially in order the more efficaciously to guard the minds of Catholics from the dangers of the present times. The license which is commonly confounded with liberty; the passion for saying and reviling everything; the habit of thinking and of expressing everything in print, have cast such deep shadows on men's minds that there is now greater utility and necessity for this office of teaching than ever before, lest men should be drawn away from conscience and duty. It is far indeed from our intention to repudiate all that the genius of the time begets; nay, rather, whatever the search for truth attains, or the effort after good achieves, will always be welcome by us, for it increases the patrimony of doctrine and enlarges the limits of public prosperity. But all this, to possess real utility, should thrive without setting aside the authority and wisdom of the Church."

In regard to the laws and discipline of the Church the Pope says: "The rule of life which is laid down for Catholics is not of such a nature as not to admit modifications, according to the diversity of time and place. The Church indeed possesses what her Author has bestowed on her, a kind and merciful disposition; for which reason from the very beginning she willingly showed herself to be what Paul proclaimed in his own regard: *I became all things to all men, that I might save all.* The history of all past ages is witness that the Apostolic See, to which not only the office of teaching, but also the supreme government of the whole Church, was committed, has constantly adhered *to the same doctrine, in the same sense and in the same mind;* but it has always been accustomed to so modify the rule of life that, while keeping the divine right inviolate, it has never disregarded the manners and customs of the various nations which it embraces. If required for the salvation of souls, who will doubt that it is ready to do so at the present time? But this is not to be determined by the will of private individuals, who are mostly

deceived by the appearance of right, but ought to be left to the judgment of the Church. He who would have Christian virtues to be adapted, some to one age and others to another, has forgotten the words of the Apostle: *Whom He foreknew He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son.* The Master and exemplar of all sanctity is Christ, to whose rule all must conform who wish to attain to the throne of the blessed. Now, Christ does not change with the progress of the ages, but is *yesterday and to-day, and the same forever.* To the men of all time is addressed the lesson: *Learn of Me because I am meek and humble of heart;* and at all times Christ shows Himself to us as becoming *obedient unto death,* and in every age also the word of the Apostle holds: *And they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences.* Would that more would cultivate those virtues in our day, after the example of the holy men of the past! Those who by humbleness of spirit, by obedience and abstinence, were *powerful in word and work,* were powerful aids not only to religion but to the State and society."

II. Modern Liberties.[1]

A. Their Nature.—Liberalism is in its very nature the father and the abettor of what are called modern liberties. It boasts, moreover, of having given rise to them, and proclaims them the great and immortal conquests of our times. Thus liberalism may also be defined as the doctrine which recognizes the same rights in evil as in good, in error as in

[1] Leo XIII., Encycl. on Human Liberty; Lilly, W. S., chapters on European History, Shibboleths, A Century of Revolution; Manning, Essays, III. Ser. (Liberty of the Press); Hergenröther, Catholic Church and State, I., Essay 5; Br. W., vi. 520, xv.; A. C. Q. viii.; C. W. xxix. 852, xxxvii. 289, 741; M. xlviii. 200; D. R. New Ser. iv. 517, xxvii. 1, 555; xxviii. 1, 503, xxix. 193, III. Ser. xx. 118. Confer Commentaries on the Syllabus of Pius IX. On the Roman Index see Baart, Roman Court, etc.; C. W. xlv. 55; Br. W. vi. 520.

truth, and consequently professes that all opinions must be respected. It is the system which preaches and favors everywhere those modern liberties. Let us, then, consider them in themselves and in their effects, and establish in the next paragraph a rule of action in regard to political constitutions based upon these liberties.

Leo XIII. in enumerating modern liberties names successively *liberty of conscience and of worship, liberty of the press, liberty of education or instruction,* to which we shall add *liberty of association.* Let us briefly explain them, following the same guide, and learn how we are to regard them. Liberty of *worship,* which is also frequently called liberty of *conscience,*[1] grants to every man the right to profess whatever religion he pleases, or even to profess none at all. This same liberty, considered from the social point of view, would forbid the State to render worship to God, or authorize any public worship; no religion or church must be preferred to another; all religions have equal claims, regardless of the faith of the people, even though it were all Catholic. Liberty of the *press* means the right of each one to express by the pen. to propagate by writings, any doctrines whatsoever on moral, political, social, philosophic, and religious matters, falsehood even as truth, however much they may savor of impiety and immorality. Liberty of *education* proclaims the natural right of every one to propagate these same doctrines by private and public instruction. Liberty of *association* asserts the right of forming any societies or unions whatever, though they be secret and dangerous to religion and society. Let us not forget that it is not a question here of simple tolerance, but of the acknowledgment of what is declared to be a natural, sacred, and imprescriptible right. Then remember that *a right* is a moral power, and that the right of one man always implies in other men and in rulers the

[1] See O'Reilly, ch. 22; Holaind, Nat. Law, 1. 4; I. E. R., July '96. Later on, speaking of the Edict of Nantes, we shall explain a very important distinction between liberty of conscience and that of worship.

duty of respecting it and making it respected. It is true certain restrictions have been formulated in regard to the use of these liberties, but these restrictions, while in themselves quite illogical, remain usually a mere matter of theory, to be forgotten in practice. In the eyes of the modern State it is no longer an impious crime to proclaim in public the non-existence of a God.[1]

B. THEIR FALSITY.—They are *false in principle*. We have shown that the Catholic religion alone is true and binding upon all men, and that this religion is identified with the Roman Catholic Church. This Church alone, by the will of God, has the right to exist and to spread throughout the world, to demand faith and obedience from all men, as every man is bound to seek his salvation and thus to attain his last end. Every doctrine opposed to her teaching, and all morals contrary to her moral law, are condemned without further proof or appeal. Neither religious error nor moral evil, the two deadly poisons for the intellect and the will, can ever have any right of existence or propagation.

It follows, moreover, that no individual or government may lawfully place any obstacle to the exercise of this exclusive right of the Catholic Church. In fact right and duty are correlative terms; the right of one person necessarily implies the duty of others to respect that right. Again, therefore, it follows that neither individual nor government can lawfully claim for error or evil, heresy, godlessness, and immorality a natural right to exist or expand. Error and evil have no such right; on the contrary, it belongs exclusively to truth and goodness. Herein we find in principle the inevitable condemnation of these modern liberties. Indeed what else are they but the proclamation of the rights of error and evil, and the open refusal to respect and protect rights be-

[1] Needless to say that we treat of the liberties of the press, speech, and association only from the *religious* standpoint. As long as dogma and morality are not touched, the religious authority will not interfere, else it would go beyond its power.

longing exclusively to the Catholic Church? This is clearly implied in the description given above of these liberties.

C. Their Fatal Consequences.—The illustrious Pontiff has no difficulty in demonstrating that these alleged liberties, understood in this way, are contrary not only to faith but to reason itself. He makes it clearly evident how disastrous their application must be, and in reality is, to individuals, to families, and to society. "The evils of the present time, the number and gravity of which we cannot ignore, have arisen in great part," he says, "from these much-vaunted liberties, which it was believed contained the germs of salvation and of glory. Facts have destroyed this hope. Instead of sweet and salutary fruit, bitter and poisonous fruits have been the result." Let us indicate briefly a few of the fatal effects produced by the application of liberal doctrines.

First effect: *The gradual weakening and extinction of faith and religion.* It is almost impossible for even intelligent men wholly to escape the influence of their social environment. If it present the spectacle of religious indifference, how will they remain attached in heart and soul to religion? How will they have the courage to practise all their duties faithfully? When the masses, particularly children and the uneducated, see the agents of the government indifferent to the Catholic religion, affecting to make no distinction between religious truth and error, their moral and Christian sense will necessarily be weakened, and they, in their turn, will regard religion as a thing of secondary or no importance.

Moreover, an evil press and neutral, that is to say, godless teaching will insensibly but surely stifle the faith in the hearts of the people. For this reason liberalism, trusting to these inevitable results of modern liberties, is willing at times, to restrain the impatience of those who would openly resort to violence to do away with the Church.

Second effect: There is but one step from perversion of mind and contempt of religion to *perversion of heart.* Why

should not one who has ceased to love God, to fear His justice, and who has no hope of eternal happiness, abandon himself to the violence of his passions? Man thirsts for happiness; if he no longer seeks it where it is to be found, in noble submission to God, in peace of conscience, and the firm hope of eternal reward, he is forced to seek it here below in the satisfaction of his passions, even of the most brutal. This is so constantly verified by experience that we do not need to insist upon it.

Third effect: *The perils which threaten modern society.* When freed from the salutary restraint of religion why will not the poor look with envy upon the possessions of the rich, and why, when they find themselves the stronger, will they not take forcible possession of that which they covet? "Need we be astonished," says Leo XIII., "that men of inferior conditions try to raise palaces and emulate the fortunes of the rich? Is it astonishing that there is no longer any peace in public or private life, and that the human race has almost reached the extremes of life?" Behold to what the doctrine of liberalism inevitably leads. No doubt many who profess and advocate it do not see its disastrous consequences, but their short-sightedness does not destroy the incontrovertible logic of facts; sooner or later the doctrine will bear its natural fruit, anarchy and revolution.[1]

Objection.—There is a specious objection which it is important to answer. God, the supreme Legislator, it is argued, granted liberty to man, therefore civil society or power may do likewise.

[1] "If we take away belief in the next world, the man of the people must necessarily and lawfully claim equality in this, and he will claim it with forcible logic, with gnashing of teeth, and rage in his heart, and firearms in hand. 'My soul,' he exclaims, 'is only a growth, and God is only an hypothesis. You take from me the restraining fear of hell, you rob me of the blessed hope of paradise; then, fear and hope taken from me, all that remains are the temporal possessions of this world. We desire them and we will have them.'" (Mgr. Mermillod.)

Reply.—1st. To solve this difficulty it suffices to make the *essential distinction* between physical liberty, or simple power, and moral liberty, or right. God, you say, gave man liberty. True; but which kind of liberty? He gave him physical liberty, that is, the possibility of choosing between good and evil, but, so far from permitting him to use his liberty to do evil, He imposed on him the moral obligation to make use of it to attain his last end by doing good. So true is this that He threatens with hell those who choose to do evil and reserves to Himself the right to punish them eternally. Society cannot, even if it would, rob man of this physical liberty; but it does not imitate the action of God if it grant man the right to do evil with impunity.

2d. Moreover, to set one's actions by those of another, one must be in an *analogous* position. Now, in regard to liberty there are *several* important *differences* between the divine and the human government.

a. "God is Judge," says St. Thomas, "because He is Creator," and in Him the judicial and the creative act reach beyond the insignificant duration of time. When one's field of action is eternity, why hasten the course of justice? Are these the conditions of human government?

b. While waiting the supreme and inevitable reparation, God has placed side by side with liberty in *this life* all the *correctives*, commandments, exhortations, promises, threats, interior grace, etc., necessary to *protect* it in its power for good and *thwart* it in its power for evil. Moreover, He has created domestic society and civil society and invested them with punitive power. He commands parents even to chastise their children and not to spare the rod (Prov. xiii. and xxii.); and St. Paul reminds rulers that they bear not the sword in vain, that they are God's ministers, avengers to execute wrath upon him that doth evil (Rom. xiii.). Is it in this sense that human government seeks to imitate God's government?

Remark.—It is clearly evident from what has been said

above that neither the Church nor the State can be taxed with intolerance and tyranny when they seek, as they did in the Middle Ages, to regulate the exercise of the human will, and to diminish for men the facilities for evil and thus prevent them from risking their happiness and welfare. Such restrictions, so far from being an *act of violence*, are, on the contrary, a *great benefit* to society, facilitating for its members the accomplishment of duty and rendering neglect or violation of duty more difficult. Now such are the benefits which result from the intimate union of Church and State when circumstances render it possible. By protecting the Church of Christ and prohibiting opposing creeds the State does not violate man's liberty, but comes to *the aid of his weakness* by shielding him from error. It would clearly be absurd to maintain that it was violating the rights of the human intelligence to teach and enlighten it that it may be able to distinguish truth from falsehood; why should it be less absurd to claim that it was tyrannical—that it was doing violence to man's will to remove from about him incentives to evil and help him to attain the good for which he was created? It might just as well be said that the parapet wall which guards a bridge is an attempt to interfere with the free circulation of the crowd, or that the father of a family violates the rights of his children when he will not suffer immoral or impious doctrines to infect their frank, innocent souls and forbids them all that is of a nature to corrupt them. Moreover, as we have already said, the right to be impious, blasphemous, or vicious does not, cannot exist for man, and the State violates no right when it prevents its subjects from destroying beliefs necessary for their eternal happiness, or from weakening all that serves as the basis of civil as well as religious society.

It is remarkable how readily these sophists admit on the one hand that it is not violating human liberty to forbid and punish certain crimes, such as assassination, theft, incendiarism, which militate against the temporal welfare of

subjects, and, on the other hand, denounce as tyranny all attempt to remove causes productive of evils still more serious, since they compromise the eternal welfare of these same subjects.

III. Tolerance.

We cannot transcribe here the luminous pages in which Leo XIII. indicates the remedy for this evil of liberalism. But guided by his teaching, we would explain why the Church, "while condemning in principle these false and injurious liberties, recognizes that there are circumstances when they may be licitly *tolerated.*" Toleration always supposes something evil which is endured and permitted for grave reasons.[1]

A. Let us hear, first of all, what the sovereign Pontiff says on this subject: "The Church, in her motherly appreciation, takes into consideration the weight of human infirmity, and she is aware of the movement by which minds and affairs are swayed at the present time. For these motives, while granting rights only to what is true and just, she is not opposed to the tolerance which public powers think necessary to use in regard to certain things contrary to truth and justice, in view of avoiding greater evil or of attaining or preserving a greater good."

We see, therefore, that there is an important distinction to be made in regard to modern liberties. These liberties, which consist in conceding to every man a natural right to profess

[1] Balmes, European Civilization, ch. 34, 35, 67; Letters to a Sceptic, l. 7; Hergenröther, Church and State, II., Essays 16, 17; Rev. W. C. Robinson, Liberty of Conscience; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Introd. I.; Gibbons, Faith of Our Fathers, ch. 18; Bishop England's Works, vol. ii., l. 10 to Wm. Hawley; Br. W. vii. 320, 479, x., xi., xii., xiii.; A. C. Q. xv. 301, xix. 508; C. W. iv., v., xxiii. 243, xli. 363 (freedom of worship); D. R. Old Ser. ix. 396, xxxix. 462, New Ser. viii. 347, xxvii. 215. On Mary Tudor see D. R. New Ser. xxv. 435, xxii. 363, xxiii. 324, xxiv. 110.

any religion he chooses, to propagate through the press error and evil as much as truth and righteousness, are evil and of themselves condemnable: this is what is ordinarily called *the thesis* (theory). Nevertheless there are circumstances of time or place when these liberties may be conscientiously tolerated, sustained, defended, in order to avoid greater evils: this is what we call *the hypothesis* (practice).[1]

B. Let us give now a few proofs to establish the lawfulness of this tolerance under certain circumstances.

1st. *The interest of the Church itself* and of its divine mission may require this tolerance. It is an undisputed principle that of two evils we must choose the lesser, and that one evil may be lawfully tolerated in order to avoid a greater. Now, in a given country and at a given time (when, for example, these modern liberties already incorporated in the constitution and laws of the country have passed into fact and practice), the interest of truth and religion may require that this state of affairs be allowed to remain, at least for a time, in order to avoid a greater evil or not to render

[1] This distinction between thesis and hypothesis is to be found in a host of questions in every-day life, and common sense enforces it frequently, though we are not always aware of it. Hypothesis is the application of the principles of the thesis according to the circumstances of the case; thus to correct a child who does wrong is a father's duty—this is the thesis; to correct him at a certain time and in a certain way might be imprudent—this is the hypothesis. Food is necessary to animal life—this is the thesis; but it may be poison for a sick man—this is the hypothesis. It is the same with religious truth. It possesses of itself imprescriptible and exclusive rights; but there may be circumstances when it is not well rigidly to enforce these rights, and when error or evil may be tolerated. It is in this sense that Leo XIII., after declaring that neither society nor individuals are permitted to treat all religions alike (the thesis), adds farther on: "If the Church judges that it is not permitted to place the various worships on the same legal footing as the true religion, she does not for this reason condemn the heads of government who, in view of some good to be obtained or of some evil to be avoided, tolerate these various worships, permitting them to have their place in the State" (the hypothesis).

all good impossible. To attempt in such a conjunction of circumstances to abolish these liberties already established would not serve the interest of the Church, but would excite against her hatred and reprisals by exposing the State to deplorable trouble and discord.

2d. This, moreover, is the *teaching of theology*. Interpreted by St. Thomas, it declares it lawful in certain cases to tolerate even pagan worship. With how much greater reason may the tolerance of modern liberties be justified, since their most extreme abuses never, like paganism, go so far as to deify creatures and vices!

3d. *The conduct of the Church* proves the lawfulness of this tolerance. If modern liberties could never be tolerated, she would have had to oblige Constantine on the very day of his conversion to banish absolutely the worship of false gods from his kingdom. In the case of the return of a Protestant prince to the faith, she would have to require of him the immediate abolition of the liberty hitherto allowed his subjects to profess the Protestant religion. Now the Church has never acted in this way, and it is not in this sense that Gregory XVI. (Encycl. *Mirari vos*, 1832) and Pius IX. (Encycl. *Quanta Cura*, 1864) condemned these liberties.

We find in the Roman review *La Civilta Cattolica* the following written in 1868, which seems to be a summary of the doctrine we have just been stating:

"With the exception of a very small number all sincere Catholics agree in believing that liberty of worship is an absurd principle. To place truth in the same rank with error —is it not as monstrous from a social as from an individual point of view? Catholics profess, therefore, that such a principle applied to the political order must in its *very nature* be injurious. At the same time they admit that in certain cases evil must be tolerated because there are circumstances when, in consequence of the lack of good dispositions in a subject, unity of religion cannot be imposed without resorting to violence, which Catholic principles condemn. The

regimen suited to one in health would be fatal to a sick man, yet no one would be so foolish as to insist that the regimen for the sick man is the ideal of hygiene, and that all must submit to it. Without the principle of liberty of worship properly understood, it is impossible to govern a people where unity of religion no longer exists, and which is socially divided by various beliefs. But to represent this state of things as a state of social perfection, to claim that it must be introduced where its introduction is not commanded by positive necessity, would be as absurd as to say that medicine is the true food of man, or that there is no better means of preserving the purity of morals in a household than to throw the doors open to all kinds of corrupt and evil men."

COROLLARIES.—The preceding principles solve several apparent difficulties.

1st. They make us understand how one can be at the same time an *excellent Christian* and an *excellent citizen* in a country where modern liberties are proclaimed by the constitution.

2d. They explain, also, the different action of the Church in different countries in regard to the liberty accorded to dissenters. In a State where the Church enjoys all her rights she would injure the success of her divine mission if she were to yield a place to error or to evil. Hence she cannot, without failing in her duty, permit such an innovation. On the contrary, in a country where the true religion is oppressed, where liberty hardly exists at all except for those who attack and hinder religion, we can understand that the Church accepts civil tolerance, that is, the introduction of a new state of things enabling her to recover at least a portion of her rights.

3d. They make us understand, finally, why, under the rule of a constitution securing liberty of worship to all, the Church may and should stoutly claim her share of the liberty due her in virtue of this constitution. It would be ridiculous to say that in acting thus she abandons her own principles, or that she abdicates her rights; she simply acts like a proprietor

who, deprived of his possessions by the triumph of communism, afterwards claims, in virtue of the very principles of communism, his proper share of the common hoard. In acting thus the proprietor does not deny his own principles or abdicate his rights as a proprietor, but he endeavors, by resorting to an argument *ad hominem*, to recover at least a portion of the possessions of which he has been unjustly deprived.

Summary and Conclusions.—A. From all that precedes we must conclude that in the relations between Church and State four different conditions may exist.

1st. An intimate *union* or alliance; the State recognizing only the true religion, exclusively protecting it and banishing all other worships.

2d. *Civil* tolerance, properly so called; the Catholic religion remaining the religion of the State, and as such protected; but at the same time the civil power tolerating, more or less, the public exercise of one or several dissenting worships. Such was the French Charter under Louis XVIII.

3d. *Absolute* tolerance or practical indifference; this is what is to-day called liberty of worship. It consists in the State placing itself outside of all religions, and recognizing none as its own, or as being entitled to its protection. This *separation* may be more or less marked; thus in France the Charter of 1830 made all recognized religions equal before the law. In America the separation is almost absolute; in Belgium the separation was less complete, particularly immediately after 1830.

4th. *Dogmatic* tolerance or *theoretic* indifference. Here also the State is indifferent to all worships, but on the ground that it believes and professes that man has a natural right to practise whatever religion he pleases or to practise none at all, or that one can be saved in all religions or without any religion; that it is a matter of indifference whether we adore Jesus Christ or blaspheme Him.

From these four possible situations we have proved that

an intimate alliance ought to exist between Church and State when societies are in their normal and perfect state. As to dogmatic tolerance, as it is essentially evil, flowing from principles as false as they are subversive of good, it can never be permitted. Hence it is formally condemned by the Church. But as governments are not always so happily constituted that the two powers lend each other mutual aid, and as, in the troubled times in which we live, this much-to-be-desired agreement has become impossible, recourse must necessarily be had to *civil* tolerance, properly so called, and even to *absolute* tolerance.

B. Two things, however, are to be observed in the exercise of this tolerance:

1st. Though civil tolerance, and even practical indifference, may be licit under the circumstances indicated, the things thus tolerated by modern constitutions do not cease to be in themselves reprehensible before God and in the consciences of individuals. If, in virtue of the liberty of the press, the civil power permits the utterance of the most terrible blasphemies, these outrages upon the Divinity are no less, from the point of view of conscience, horrible crimes. It is the same with all acts intrinsically evil which civil legislatures tolerate for grave reasons. Those who perpetrate them will be no less condemned by the divine Legislator, who will punish them in His own time.

2d. The Church cannot admit as a general and absolute thesis that the liberty granted to heterodox worships, to the propagation of error and of evil, is what is best and most conformable to the nature of man and to true civilization. She cannot find good or right in itself the freedom awarded to that which ruins souls, or hail it as a manifestation of a society's progress. Thus Pius IX. has condemned the following proposition: "The best condition of all political society requires in our time that the State be constituted and governed regardless of religion, as if it did not exist, or without recognizing any difference between the true and

the false religion." (Encycl. *Quanta Cura* and Syllabus Prop. 77, 78, 79, 80.)

C. It is easy now to indicate what should be the conduct of the faithful children of the Church in regard to constitutions which admit modern liberties.

a. When there is question of elaborating a constitution, the legislators must, after considering before God the situation, the strength and the weakness of the society which they represent, endeavor to realize the type of a Christian constitution, and approximate as closely as possible to the ideal. When they act under pressure of real necessity, they are not censurable for tolerating an evil which they cannot prevent without exciting disastrous and deplorable calamities, as fatal to the Church as to the State.

b. If the constitution already exists, and if it is not conformable to the principles of the Church, true Catholics obey it in everything which is not contrary to the laws of God and of the Church; they will never attempt to overthrow the social edifice by violence, for this they know God forbids.

c. If this constitution is the result of a transaction required by circumstances, they will be loyal to their oath of allegiance, and if they are in power, they will not persecute those in favor of whom they are pledged to exercise tolerance.

d. They will beware, however, of saying that such a constitution is, *absolutely speaking, the best.* Above all, they will not claim that this civil tolerance is the result of a sacred and imprescriptible natural right for those who enjoy it. On the contrary, they will frankly proclaim true principles, the exclusive rights of truth, of the Church of Jesus Christ. While admitting the necessities of the time and of the country, they will deplore these necessities, the imperfect state of present society, the blindness of minds. They will neglect no *peaceable* means of bringing about a better state of affairs, using every *lawful* means authorized by the constitution itself. In spreading about them, by speech and writing, the whole

truth, they will endeavor to render more and more possible, by the turning of minds to true principles, the complete observance of the laws of Christian society—a pledge of prosperity for the State as well as for the Church.

IV. Notions concerning Liberty.[1]

There are few questions concerning which thoughtlessness or bad faith has called forth more errors and dangerous sophisms than liberty. How many confound lawful and real liberty with a chimerical and even criminal independence![2] How many see in the mere physical power we possess of doing evil a justification, or rather a right, to do evil! If man really had by nature the right to teach, to write, to do whatsoever he would or could, it is evident that modern liberties would be most legitimate in themselves and as an absolute thesis.

"If," says Leo XIII., "in the discussions current concerning liberty, is meant that lawful and just liberty such as reason

[1] Balmes, ch. 67; Lilly, chapters on European History, vol. i.; Gibbons, Faith, etc., ch. 17; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essay 7; Br. W. vii. 479, 534, xx., xiii., xiv.; A. C. Q. vi. 517; C. W. x. 721, xxxv. 639; M. liv. 15, lxiii. 457; D. R. III. Ser. xi. 62.

[2] Independence means that a being is indebted to no one, and, consequently, has received nothing from another and has nothing to receive from any one whomsoever. This absolute independence belongs and can belong only to God, because He alone possesses in Himself the reason of His existence and of all His perfections, and He Himself is His own end and the source of His infinite happiness. Man, on the contrary, possesses only a being which has been lent him: he holds from God his existence, his faculties, and all that serves to develop and exercise them. And this gift is bestowed by God upon man every moment of his existence, for conservation, like creation, is an uninterrupted act: if God were to cease for a moment to uphold man, he would fall back at once into the abyss of his nothingness. It follows, then, that man is *completely* and *every moment dependent* upon his Creator; he is dependent *by essence*, for he is essentially or by essence a *created* being. He is even more so, if possible, in the order of grace and glory, to which the divine Goodness has raised him.

and our word has just described, no one would dare to pursue the Church with the sovereignly unjust accusation that she is the enemy of liberty of governments. . . . The Church has always deserved well of this excellent gift of our nature, and she will not cease to deserve well of it. . . . And yet there are many who believe that the Church is the enemy of human liberty. This arises from the defective and, as it were, contrary ideas which they form of liberty. This defective and exaggerated idea of liberty causes it to be applied to many things in which man, according to the judgment of sound reason, cannot be free."

It is then of extreme importance, when speaking of liberty, to make distinctions.

Liberty, in general, brings to our minds the idea of freedom from any restraint whatever. But as these restraints may be of a different nature, so there are different kinds of liberty. *Physical* or psychological liberty differs from *moral* liberty; *political* liberty must not be confounded with *civil* or social liberty; and when they speak of *modern* liberties still another meaning is given to liberty.

1. *Natural* or *physical liberty*, which is also called liberty of indifference, liberty of choice or election, free-will, consists in that disposition of our nature in virtue of which our will, uniting all the conditions necessary to action, preserves the faculty or power (physical power) to act or not to act, to determine in favor of one thing rather than another.

Liberty consists essentially in the power of determining one's own action by and through oneself; it does not consist at all in the power of choosing evil. In fact God is infinitely free, yet He cannot will evil; freely He chooses from among the different forms and degrees of goodness the one He wishes to realize in the created order. The saints in heaven also are free; yet sin has become impossible with them; enlightened by the full light of truth and possessing the infinite good, how can they have the slightest thought or least velleity of renouncing this perfect happiness. The possibility of

violating the moral law, so far from being a perfection of our nature, cannot even be called *strength* or *power*. This is very evident: no one certainly would think of saying, "I have the *power* to be ill." We say, "Unfortunately I cannot always keep well." In regard to the intelligence, no one would consider it a mark of strength to be able to reason ill, to draw false conclusions from true principles. This is evidently a sign of weakness, an imperfection of the faculty. Then let us be consistent and apply the same reasoning to liberty in man; let us say that being able to choose evil, that is, to turn from our final end, which is happiness, is not a mark of power, but, on the contrary, a weakness with which the faculty of the will is afflicted as long as we are in this period of probation.

Is man endowed with liberty? Of this there is no possible doubt. The existence of *free-will* in man is an undeniable fact attested by the analysis of our free act, by the innermost sense of the individual, and the affirmation of all mankind. On the other hand, to deny man's free-will would be to destroy the foundation of all morality and of society itself.

We are so free that, though human violence may restrain our exterior actions, it has no power over the act of our will. "My body is in your hands," the martyr said to his persecutors, "but you have no power over my soul." The Church has always defended this liberty against all opinions to the contrary. Liberty is a blessing; Leo XIII. calls it *praestantissimum donum*, most excellent blessing of our nature; it is in fact in virtue of our free-will that we are responsible for our acts and that we can merit heaven. While animals obey only the senses, and are impelled only by natural instinct to seek that which is useful and to avoid that which is injurious to them, man, enlightened by intelligence, resists when he pleases the unreflecting inclinations of his passions: this is the seal of his greatness.

We meet, however, philosophers called fatalists, determinists (fatalism, determinism, is the natural consequence of

materialism) who have ventured to deny the existence of free-will. But this denial exists, and can exist, only in their books; refuted by all mankind, it is still more strongly denied by the actions and by the words of these same philosophers. Every tongue which utters the words virtue and vice, merit and demerit, praise and blame, reward and punishment, conscience and remorse; every order intimated, every law promulgated, every counsel asked, every repentance expressed, every chastisement inflicted, proclaims human liberty, free-will, and shows what is the intimate conviction of the world and of philosophy. Do we not treat in an absolutely different manner the children who have not attained the age of reason, the insane, and men in the full enjoyment of reason? Is there not a marked distinction between the chains of the galley-slave and the manacles of the insane? Whence is this difference, if it is not from free-will? It is what, in our eyes, makes the first a criminal, while the misdeeds of the second make him only an object of pity.[1]

2. *Moral liberty*, when there is question of an act or a series of acts, consists in the absence of any obligation binding the will to perform or to omit these acts.

We are physically free; this we have seen and have solidly, though briefly, proved. But do we enjoy absolute moral freedom? In other words, is our will restrained by no moral obligation? Have we a *right* to do whatever our physical strength leaves us free to accomplish? No man in his senses would dare to sustain this proposition; only an atheist can and must affirm it.

It is evident to every reasoning mind that we cannot *rightfully* or *lawfully*, that is, with the approval of conscience or without neglecting a duty of conscience, do whatever our natural power permits. A son, for example, may be strong enough to kill his father, but no one would venture to say

[1] In defence of free-will see Ward, Ph. of Theism; Maher, S.J., Psychology, ch. 18; A. C. Q. xxvii. p. 252; Rickaby, S.J., Essay 6.

that he had a right to do it. Hence there is an essential difference between force and right. Might is not right. If this distinction did not exist, we should have a right to acquit as innocent the basest parricide; the brigand who lies in wait for the traveller, or openly attacks him, would have the right to assassinate his victim, as he has the power or the strength to do it.

Liberalism perpetually confounds physical or natural liberty with moral liberty. Because of this confusion it attributes to man a *natural right* to propagate error and evil, and regards modern liberties as an absolute good. Man is free, says liberalism; this liberty is a right of his nature: hence the State must respect and cause it to be respected. Man, we answer, is free *physically*, so free that no one, not even the State, can hinder an act of his will. But is he always *morally* free? Has he a right to abuse his freedom to do evil and to propagate it? If you affirm that he has, why then, we ask, does the State make laws, erect tribunals and prisons? Can one be punished for the exercise of a lawful right?

It is well to remark also the equivocal interpretation which the word *power* admits, for it is the double meaning of this word which misleads many minds, and gives rise to sophisms on the subject of liberty. I cannot morally or lawfully do all that which I have the material or physical power to do.

The foundation or primary basis of moral law or of the obligation laid upon the human will is *the will of God*, the Creator, the sovereign Master of man and his supreme law-giver. Man's absolute independence of moral law can be affirmed only by an atheist.

Hence it is absolutely false to say: man is free, therefore he is subject to no authority. The contrary thesis is true. Man is free, but he must make a lawful use of his liberty. Man is free, but he must submit to God, and to all power which comes from God. To refuse to recognize, absolutely

or partially, the necessary authority of God over His creatures is not only folly, a crime, but base ingratitude. Man's glory and happiness, as well as his most imperative duty, consist, on the contrary, in recognizing practically, in his moral, private, and public life, his complete dependence on the supreme Master of all things, on God, who is infinite Wisdom, boundless Goodness, the supreme Good.

If man is incomparably superior to the animals, it is because he is capable of making a lawful use of his liberty—a use conformable to the noble nature with which God has endowed him. An animal is irresistibly led to his end, but it is not fitting that one whom God has destined for boundless happiness should be forced against his will to his supreme end. It is more glorious for God and for man that man merit this happiness by making good use of his liberty, by regulating his conduct by the light of reason and the divine precepts.

We see, therefore, that liberty does not, as it is frequently supposed, consist essentially in being free to do as one wills, particularly in freedom to do evil, to act contrary to the light of reason and faith, to turn from our last end, and to prepare our own degradation, our own misery. This is an abuse of liberty, or rather it is license. But the liberty truly to be prized, that which constitutes the nobility of our being, is the power with which the will is endowed to choose the means capable of aiding us to attain our final end; or, what comes to the same thing, *the power to do good.* Montesquieu expresses this excellently well when he says that "liberty can consist only in the power to do *what we ought to will.*"

"True liberty, that which is desirable in the individual order," says Leo XIII., "is that which frees man from the slavery of error and of the passions, which are the worst of tyrants." "In human society liberty worthy of the name does not consist in doing whatever we please, but in being able, under the protection of the civil laws, freely to live according to the requirements of the eternal law." Un-

fortunately "there is a large number of men who, after the example of Lucifer—the author of these criminal words: 'I will not serve,'—understand by the word liberty only that which is pure and absurd license. Such are they who belong to that wide-spread and powerful school who, borrowing their name from the word liberty, would be called liberals." (Encycl. cit.)

3. *Political liberty* is twofold in character. *a.* For a nation it consists in political independence in regard to other nations. Manifestly the Church approves of all such lawful independence, since she lays it as a duty upon her children throughout the world to give effectual proof of their love for their country, and, at need, to lay down their lives to defend it from its enemies. *b.* For each individual it consists in the right to take part, in a greater or less degree, directly or indirectly (by right of election), in the government of his country. It is evidently not the same in an absolute, an aristocratic, a constitutional monarchy as in a simple republic.

Now, *provided the sacred rights of religion are properly respected,* the Church shows no preference for any of these various forms of government; she accommodates herself to all, for she can save souls as easily in a Christian republic as in a Christian monarchy. Therefore, provided a legitimate government, whatever it may be, allows her the free exercise of her own mission, without usurping any of her rights, the Church, on her part, will never, in any way whatever, interfere with the mission of the State to procure the temporal welfare of the people.

4. *Civil* or *social liberty,* which is also called *individual* liberty, may be defined as the power of each individual to exercise his personal activity, to provide for his own interests and those of his family, without hindrance on the part of his fellow citizens or the government. It includes liberty of person, of action, of proprietorship, of family, of community, the right to fulfil all duties of charity, to found associations for a laudable purpose, etc.

Political liberty is no doubt good and desirable, but the modern or liberal State, the tendency of which is to attain *universal centralism*, to enslave and absorb the most sacred rights of the individual, of the family, of special societies, would have us believe that liberty *par excellence* resides in the exercise of electoral rights. But in reality what does it avail me to enjoy a certain degree of political liberty, that is, to have a hundredth or a millionth part of influence in the constitution of public powers, if this government which I have contributed to establish binds my personal liberty in a thousand ways by innumerable laws, and a pitiless bureaucracy capriciously regulates my every action, and imprisons my life in an absolute slavery of details? The history of the present century, when men talk unceasingly of liberty, clearly shows that to stifle the true liberty of the citizen, and particularly that of Catholic consciences, is the dream of all who are striving to destroy Catholicism in order to establish upon its ruins a purely natural society.

Striking facts of history prove how great has ever been the Church's sympathy with civil liberty. Who but the Church established in the world of nations the only solid foundation of true liberty and equality? Did she not, in the midst of the terrible corruption wrought by pagan ideas and morals, effectually teach mankind that all are brothers and equals in the sight of God? Was it not the Church who rigidly imposed upon all—upon those who govern, as well as upon those who are governed—the duty of justice and charity? Was it not the Church who, by her doctrines, her laws, her institutions, effected the rehabilitation of woman, of the slave, of the child, of the poor, of the laborer—in a word, of all whose rights had been denied, nay, trampled under foot? (See below, Ch. V.)

CHAPTER IV.

CERTAIN ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH.

Holy in her Founder, ever pure in her doctrine and moral teaching, the Church has never ceased to lead her members to the practice of the most beautiful and even the most heroic virtues. Thus, despite human infirmity and the violence of human passions, Catholics have ever numbered among them innumerable saints, apostles, ministers, men of great and noble character, incapable of baseness, ready to devote themselves to works of the highest perfection and the most sublime charity. But though man may make a noble use of his liberty, and wage a generous war against his passions, nevertheless he is only too often led to heed their voice. The grace of Baptism, and even that of Holy Orders, does not destroy the evil inclinations of the human heart. In the course of eighteen centuries abuses could not but creep into the morals of Christian peoples; there could not but be found sins and crimes among Catholics, and even among priests and bishops neglectful of their duties.

But what do the enemies of Catholicism do at sight of these inevitable human failings? Instead of admiring the marvels wrought in souls by the doctrines of the Gospel, despite the weakness of degenerate human nature and the allurements of passion, they eagerly seize upon the abuses and faults to be found during this long series of centuries, and, making them the foundation of their polemics, never cease to cast them in the face of the Church, as if she were responsible for them. The regeneration which she has wrought in the world, her persistent condemnation of all that is contrary to the divine

law, count as naught in their eyes; the crimes of a few baptized reprobates furnish the arsenal of these scandal-mongers.

Yet, as this arsenal is not well furnished, they find themselves forced to resort continually to the same weapons, notwithstanding they have become blunt and almost harmless; they ignore the most convincing refutations, and at every opportunity cite the Inquisition, the condemnation of Galileo, and a small number of similar charges. To guard weak souls and defend the Church against these puerile accusations, the apologist must show how little foundation there is for them. This is what we shall do in the following chapter.[1]

ART. I.—INTOLERANCE OF THE CHURCH.[2]

I. In What Sense the Catholic Church is Intolerant.

If we understand the true meaning of this word, that is, in the sense of *dogmatic* or *doctrinal* intolerance, it needs no defence, and the Catholic Church is far from defending herself against this alleged reproach. Dogmatic, doctrinal, or religious tolerance amounts to *religious indifference*, which refuses to acknowledge any religion as exclusively true or of obligation. Dogmatic intolerance, on the contrary, is an essential prerogative of truth, and it is a universal and necessary consequence of the very existence of the Catholic religion, which alone is true and binding upon all men.

To reproach the Church with this intolerance is to reproach

[1] As to certain accusations prompted by ignorance or prejudice—for example, that we are obliged to believe all the fancies it may please the Pope to publish; that we adore the saints, their images and relics; that our worship consists only in exterior ceremonies; that to obtain the pardon of our sins, absolution without repentance is sufficient; that with money we can buy the forgiveness of present or future sins, and similar absurd charges—a Catholic with ordinary religious instruction can readily refute them.—Editor.

[2] See references on pp. 435, 442; also Rickaby, Oxf. Conf., I.; and C. T. S., vol. 36; Milner, End of Contr., l. 49.

her with being and with believing herself *necessary truth.* It belongs to truth to exclude all that is contrary to it, and consequently not only is true religion intolerant, but so also is all science. There is nothing more intolerant than mathematics, for the reason that it is founded on invariable principles. The Church, by the very fact that she is certain of possessing religious truth in its entirety, must inexorably condemn all error. Thus Bossuet acknowledged that "the Catholic religion is the most severe and the least tolerant of all religions;" and Jules Simon, a contemporary naturalist philosopher, confesses that "the lawfulness of ecclesiastical intolerance is beyond dispute."

We readily acknowledge that, in this sense, the other religious societies are not intolerant. J. J. Rousseau could say of Protestantism: "The Protestant religion is tolerant in principle, it is essentially tolerant, it is as tolerant as it is possible to be, since the only dogma it does not tolerate is that of intolerance." But such praise is the most crushing refutation of a religious doctrine.

But if the Catholic Church is justly intolerant of evil doctrines and vice, as truth must necessarily be, she is full of mercy for the erring and for sinners. Established for the salvation of men, she leaves nothing undone to wrest souls from their eternal ruin. Ever faithful to the command she received from God, she has striven to convert the world by the preaching of the Gospel, that is, she has striven to persuade souls and has never resorted to violence or constraint. Like her divine Master, she has at all times suffered persecutions and shed her blood for the salvation of men. If at times she has thought proper to chastise her own rebellious children, it was in virtue of a right which no one thought of disputing, and she has always administered chastisement with a motherly hand, to convert her children or to remove scandal from among them. Such has not been the conduct of heretical sects, nor of the other enemies of the Church.

II. Protestant Intolerance.[1]

It is remarkable that the same men who unjustly accuse the Church of intolerance usually award the fullest approbation to Protestantism, as if it represented the true tolerance approved by sound reason. But if we question history written by Protestants themselves, we shall see, as the Protestant Menzel affirms, that "where Protestantism reigned, intolerance reigned."

1. Luther, the first founder of Protestantism, whom they would represent as the apostle of tolerance and the liberator of thought, notwithstanding he openly denies free-will, publicly commanded his followers "to gain heaven at the point of the sword, to ascend to God on mountains of the slain." His war-cry was, "Live the Bible, death to Papists!" "Rush upon the Pope," he tells his followers, "and kill him, as well as all about him, emperors, kings, princes, and rulers." "We must wash our hands in their blood," the bold innovator repeatedly cried.

These frequent exhortations to massacre met with only too ready response, and resulted in the well-known war of the peasants (1525) enkindled in Germany by the apostate monk. As long as their ravages and cruelties were exercised in Catholic countries the innovator approved of these undisciplined hordes; but when he found them, under the

[1] Orjanam, A. F., Protestantism and Liberty (London, 1874); Spalding, M. J., Miscell., Introduction and essays 10, 11, 12; Bp. England's Works, vol. i., l. 17 to Blanco White; Marcy, ch. 27 ff.; Kenrick, Vindication of Catholics, lect. 19; Craig, Christian Persecutions; Martinet, Solution of Great Problems, ii., ch. 57 to 65; Br. W. x.; C. W. xvi. 289. On the persecution of Catholics in *England* and *Ireland* see works by Challoner, Moran, Pollen, Thompson, Morris, Foley, Madden (Penal Laws); in *Acadia*, Shea, vol. i., p. 421 ff.; A. C. Q. ix. 592, xii. 341; in *Holland*, D. R., Apr. 1894, p. 388; in *New England*, Spalding, M. J., l. c., essays 19, 20, 34; D. R. Old Ser. i. 314, xxxviii. 273; in *Prussia*, Spalding, J. L., Essays, etc.; Parsons, Studies, VI., ch. 1.

guidance of Munzer, invading countries where the Reformation had been established, he immediately excited Protestant rulers against them. "To arms, princes!" he exclaimed. "Strike, slay, kill them openly and in secret, for there is nothing more diabolical than sedition; it is a dog which will attack you if you do not destroy it." "It is not only your right," he said again to Protestant princes, "it is also your duty to establish the pure Gospel, to protect the new churches, to destroy the authority of the Pope, and to allow no strange doctrine to be propagated." "Admirable times," he exclaims elsewhere, "when princes can more easily merit heaven by massacring the peasants and by shedding blood than they could formerly by pouring forth prayers to God. Every peasant slain is lost body and soul, and belongs for eternity to the devil." More than one hundred thousand of these unfortunate creatures perished, and Luther gloried in these odious massacres. "It was I," he exclaimed, "who shed this blood by the order of God."

Such was the cold-blooded cruelty of this leader of the Reformation, whose barbarous exhortations were only too faithfully followed. The sacrilegious robbery of churches and monasteries, armed revolt, the massacre of entire populations, the Thirty Years' War which covered the country with blood and ruins, were the high achievements which signalized Protestantism in Germany.

2. And what was taking place in Switzerland? Calvin, the most infamous and the most cruel of tyrants, wrote a whole book solely to prove that heretics ought to be put to death. Adding example to precept, he caused Michael Servetus to be burned alive for the crime of heresy, James Gruet to be beheaded for an attempt to subvert his church ordinances, and Valentine Gentilis for deliberate heresy. Antoni, Funch, Bolsec, Castellio, Ochino, Alicot, and a hundred others paid with their lives for the unpardonable boldness of censuring the reformer. To abstain from any act of the new religion, such as preaching or communicating,

constituted a crime of high treason, and was punished accordingly. "Calvin," says Gallifet, a Protestant writer, "established first by craft and afterward by violence the reign of the most ferocious intolerance, of the grossest superstition, of the most impious dogmas. . . . Only blood would satisfy this base soul." This same man desired that Anabaptists should be treated as brigands. "In the legislation conceived of by this monster," says Audin, "nothing but the word death resounded; blood flowed everywhere. The scaffold or the stake cut short all resistance."

Nor were the measures of Zwinglius more gentle. Witness his letter of May 4, 1525, to Ambrose Blaurer, quoted by Janssen in *Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker*, where he declares it lawful to massacre priests, if necessary, in order to abolish images and the Mass.

3. France presented a like spectacle. The Calvinist Huguenots kindled a fierce civil war; pillaged Orléans, Pithiviers, Nîmes, Auxerre, Bourges, Montpellier, whole provinces; massacred the inhabitants and destroyed the churches they encountered in their route, hanging or drowning the priests and religious who fell into their hands. At Orthes they destroyed the whole Catholic population, numbering three thousand souls. In the year 1562 alone they put to death, according to their own account, four thousand priests and religious, destroyed twenty thousand churches and ninety hospitals. "The Queen of Navarre's violence toward priests and religious," says Bossuet, "is well known: the towers whence Catholics were cast and the abysses into which they were flung are still shown." [1]

4. Similar intolerance prevailed in Denmark, where Lutheranism was introduced with Christian II., surnamed the Nero of the North. Under his successor, Frederick II., such horrors were perpetrated upon religious that even the Protestant historian Mallet (*Histoire du Denmark, t. vi.*) says

[1] History of the Variations of Protestantism, vol. ii. See C. W., Apr. 1898. Cfr. references to art. 7 below.

that "in no country where the Reformation was established did monks suffer such vexations as in Denmark;" every Catholic priest and every one who sheltered a priest were under sentence of death. In Sweden, which became Lutheran under Gustavus Vasa, the cruelty of this prince toward Catholics was so horrible and the massacres so terrible that they excited the indignation of Luther himself.

5. The history of the schism in England, which sprang from the passions of a debauched prince, says that Henry VIII. condemned to the scaffold two queens, two cardinals, twenty archbishops and bishops, more than five hundred abbots, priors, monks, a host of doctors, dukes, counts and other noblemen, among the latter the celebrated Thomas More, more than seventy-two thousand Catholics of all ranks. "I would I could efface from our annals," says Fitz William, the Anglican author of the "Letters of Atticus," "all trace of the long series of iniquities which accompanied the Reformation in England. They record injustice and oppression, rapine, murder, and sacrilege. Such were the means by which the inexorable and bloodthirsty tyrant Henry VIII., the founder of our faith, established the supremacy of his new church. All who wished to preserve the religion of their fathers and continue to adhere to the authority which he himself had taught them to revere were treated as rebels, and soon became his victims." It was principally under the reign of the *virgin queen*, the *good* Elizabeth, as she was called (1559–1603), that the persecutions against Catholics assumed the most barbarous character. This worthy daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn put to death no fewer Catholics than her father; her atrocities startled the world and surpassed those of pagan antiquity. The massacres she ordered in Ireland were so terrible that, according to the Protestant writer Leland, "little more than ashes and dead bodies remained for her Majesty Elizabeth to govern."

6. We cannot read without a shudder the account which the Protestant historian Kerroux gives in his *Abrégé de l'histoire*

de la Hollande, t. ii., of the cruel tortures which Catholics endured in the Netherlands. It is well known that in the provinces of Brabant and Flanders alone the Gueux destroyed in less than five days more than four hundred churches and cathedrals; that they perpetrated upon priests, religious, and the Catholic faithful atrocities which could not be believed, if the lamentable facts were not confirmed by incontestable historical documents.

Such was everywhere the conduct of Protestants toward those who remained faithful to the religion of their fathers. Let us not forget that the reformers proclaimed free interpretation of the Scriptures, that is, the right to believe what one pleases, as the fundamental dogma of the new religion.

III. Intolerance of Other Enemies of the Church.[1]

The philosophy of the eighteenth century has shown itself little less gentle or tolerant than Protestantism. The same Rousseau who vigorously protested against the cruel dogma of intolerance, and who recognized nothing true in any *positive* religion, does not hesitate to declare that the State may prescribe a *civil*, consequently *positive*, religion and that under pain of death! It belongs to the sovereign, he says in the *Contrat social*, "to fix the articles of religion." Then he adds these words, in which cruelty rivals effrontery: "Without the power of compelling any one to believe the articles of faith contained in the religion of a country, the sovereign may banish from the State those who do not believe them, not on the ground of impiety, but as detrimental to the State. . . . If any one after publicly acknowledging these dogmas conduct himself as though he did not believe them, he should *be put to death;* he has committed

[1] On persecution in Russia and Poland see Parsons, Studies, V., ch. 3, 4 (A. C. Q., xxii., xxiii.); D. R. Old Ser. xiv. 223, Oct. '95; C. W. lix. 757; M. lxxx. 166, Sept. '95.

the greatest of crimes, he has lied before the law." Yet, according to Rousseau, no man's faith should be forced.

This tolerance of the sophist of Geneva is still that of certain quasi-humanitarian philosophers of our day. Some of them go so far as to regret that the reformers in 1793 did not complete their work of destruction; they are only waiting an opportunity to resort to brute force against Catholicism in order to render the practice of it absolutely impossible, to stifle it in the mire. Witness the urgent counsels given by Edgar Quinet; they are addressed to all who, like himself, are inspired with satanic hatred of the Church. The events which have taken place before our eyes show that these counsels of sovereign intolerance were understood and followed.[1]

REMARK.—No doubt there have been Catholic princes who, through excess of unenlightened zeal, resorted to violence to convert infidels or sectarians, but in doing so they followed their personal inspiration and not the rules of the Church. The Church does not admit this kind of apostolate, and she cannot be held responsible for that which she condemns. It is quite otherwise with Protestantism and infidelity: here the very founders of the Reformation, the leaders themselves of infidel philosophy, incited the most cruel intolerance by word and example. Yet it is remarkable how rarely the enemies of the Church are heard to condemn these atrocities. On the contrary, they praise and encourage the countries where Catholics are oppressed at the present day, and their intolerant conduct is held up as worthy of imitation. Is not this the climax of injustice, of unfairness, of inconsistency?

[1] What a terrible commentary upon this modern "Gospel of Tolerance" is furnished by the Masonic persecution raging this very day against the religious orders and the hierarchy in France!—EDITOR.

IV. On the Maxim: Outside the Church there Is No Salvation.[1]

But the Catholic Church cannot, it will be said, defend herself against the charge of intolerance and cruelty when she publicly proclaims that there is no salvation for those who die outside her fold. What numbers she condemns to eternal damnation only because they do not belong to the Church of Rome! We have already given in a few words the solution of this difficulty. But what we have said requires further development. We shall see whether the old man whom Rousseau causes to speak in such moving terms, really deserves our pity.[2]

This maxim is only a perfectly rational conclusion of that

[1] Dr. Edw. Hawarden, Charity and Truth; Hay, Sincere Christian, vol. ii., append.; Schanz, III., ch. 9; Ryder (C. T. S., vol. v.); Balmes, Letters to a Sceptic, l. 16; Hunter, i., n. 181; Walsh, The Saved and Lost; Rickaby, Oxf. C., I., ch. 3; Br. W. v. 571; C. W. xxxi. 481, xlvii. 145, xlviii. 509; A. E. R., July '92; M. lvii. 363, lxxiii. 236, 344.

[2] Protestants figure most prominently among those who attack the Catholic Church on the subject of this maxim. Yet this principle with which they reproach the Church is a logical consequence of the doctrine of their principal leaders. Hence they are in contradiction with themselves. What right have they to censure in us that which they themselves have to admit, that which is explicitly professed in the formulas of faith drawn up in the earliest stages of Protestantism? For example, we read in the Helvetic Confession of Faith of 1565: "There is no salvation outside the hurch, any more than there was outside the ark; and if we would have life, we must not separate from the true Church of Jesus Christ.' The Saxon, the Belgian, and the Scotch Confessions of Faith are no less explicit on this point. "Outside the Church," says also the Calvinist catechism of the seventeenth century, "there is only damnation: all who separate from the communion of the faithful to form a sect apart should not hope for salvation so long as they remain thus separated." Moreover, Calvin himself affirms in his "Institutions" that "outside the Church we cannot hope for the remission of sins or for salvation."

which has been previously demonstrated. In fact, if the true religion, that of Jesus Christ, is necessary for salvation, and if this religion is exclusively that of the Church of Rome, we have to acknowledge that outside the Church of Rome there is no salvation; in other words, that no one can be saved if he does not belong *in some way* to this Church. Hence, if this doctrine is censurable, it is not the Church that should be reproached therefor, but her divine Founder, who made His religion obligatory for all.

To justify the Church, it is sufficient to state precisely the meaning and scope of the incriminated formula. Let us explain, therefore, in what way, according to Catholic doctrine, we must belong to the Church in order to be saved.

"In this sentence: Outside the Church there is no salvation, there is," says Card. Dechamps, "as in every penal law, a word to be supplied; this word is *voluntarily*, since every penal law supposes guilt, and guilt supposes in its turn two conditions: *fact* and *intention*. Hence to the question: Does the Church believe that there is no salvation for persons who, born and brought up where they could have no knowledge of the Church, are in invincible ignorance of the law of Jesus Christ, but have faithfully followed the light they possessed? we must answer that such is not the belief of the Church." [1]

It is certain, in fact, that a law is not of obligation when it is not *promulgated*, and that it cannot bind the consciences of those to whom it is unknown. Thus it was after He had said to His apostles, "Go preach the Gospel to every creature," that Our Saviour added, "He that doth not believe is already judged." The unbelief, therefore, which excludes from salvation is that which knows and resists the truth. As St. Paul says, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom

[1] Newman, Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching, vol. i., pp. 354–5; Lilly, Characteristics from the Writings of Card. Manning, p. 247 ff.

they have not heard? . . . Faith then cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." (Rom. x. 14, 17.)

Moreover, the theological axiom which we have already quoted: "To him who does what depends upon himself God will not refuse His grace," is perfectly applicable to the present question. He who shall have followed the light of reason, and lived in conformity with that which he believes is truth, cannot be lost. "One may," says the learned Cardinal again, "belong in heart, though not in body, to the Church. Is it not very clear that every man in good faith belongs in heart to the Church, since he would enter it if he recognized it as teaching truth? Are not all who have a sincere and general desire to cling to truth, to do God's will, in this disposition? It is, in other words, a question of *baptism of desire*, a desire *implicitly and adequately contained*, as St. Thomas Aquinas says, in the general will to use the means of salvation granted by divine Providence to man. They, therefore, who, in the event of recognizing the Church, are prepared to cast themselves upon her bosom, are regarded by God as her children, and will not fail to receive from Him the light necessary for salvation. God the Creator, who chose to be also the Saviour of the world, died for all men, and the graces granted in view of this Victim whom the eternal justice beheld immolated from the beginning of the world, *occisus ab origine mundi*, were applied to all men without exception. Hence no man is excluded from participation in the fruits of the redemption save through his own fault, through resistance to grace, and each one will be judged according to that which he has received. Could there be a doctrine more lenient and at the same time more terrible: more lenient for the blind when their ignorance is not culpable, and more terrible for the ungrateful who, to avoid the light which surrounds them, seek in darkness reasons against the justice of God?"

Let us add a few words of explanation to those of the eminent prelate; we shall take them for the most part from

P. Ollivier's excellent statement of the subject in his fifty-third and fifty-fourth Conferences.

Catholic doctrine distinguishes in the Church body and soul. The body, or visible part, consists of the members united in one society or exterior communion. The soul, or the invisible part, is sanctifying grace, the principle of supernatural life which renders man pleasing to God. To belong fully, that is, by right and fact, to the body of the Church it is necessary first to enter it by Baptism; then, when we have attained the age of reason, to adhere to it voluntarily, with full knowledge, by an act of Catholic faith; finally, we must not have incurred excommunication or have separated from the Church by embracing error. To belong to the *soul* of the Church it suffices, even if we do not form part of the body, to be in a state of grace. *Hence it is possible to belong to the Church, and consequently to be saved, without forming part of the body of the Church.* In other terms, according to Catholic doctrine, heretics, sectarians, and even infidels may possess sanctifying grace and obtain salvation. Let us explain.

1. A child born of schismatic, heretic, or infidel parents *who receives Baptism*, receives with it sanctifying grace, and preserves this grace as long as he is not guilty of mortal sin. He belongs to the soul of the Church, and if he dies in this state he will undoubtedly be saved. This is supposing, of course, that the child, attaining the use of reason, remains in invincible ignorance of the true religion, because it is impossible for him to learn of it, or he despises it because he has no doubt whatever of the truth of the religion he professes. But every one born or brought up in unbelief, heresy, or schism is bound to search for the true religion *as soon as any serious doubts arise in his mind concerning the truth of his creed.* If he neglect to do this, he can no longer enjoy the benefit of "good faith" and commits a grievous offence against God, the source and object of the true religion. Let us add that if a man, being in good faith (that is, by invincible ignorance)

outside the visible unity of God's Church, has the misfortune to lose sanctifying grace through grave sin, he may be reconciled again with God. If the sect to which he belongs has retained the Sacrament of Penance, his reconciliation will be effected through sacramental confession accompanied with at least imperfect contrition; if it rejects this sacrament, it will be by the employment of means instituted in this sect and regarded as indispensable, but in that case perfect contrition is necessary and the reason therefor is evident: he must employ these means because, judging them indispensable, he would be acting contrary to his conscience if he did not have recourse to them. At the same time, perfect contrition is necessary in this case, as the means are inefficacious of themselves.

2. As to *non-baptized* children and adults who die without attaining the use of reason, we have already stated (p. 249. n. 1) what we are taught concerning their lot.[1] They will enjoy a natural good, the possession of which would have constituted our happiness if we had not been raised to the superior order, and they will be deprived only of the *degree* of happiness resulting from the intuitive vision of God, a degree of happiness which is due to no one.[2]

Now to come to *adult infidels*, or unbaptized persons who have attained *the use of reason*—that is, Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans,—here is a summary of what the Church teaches regarding them. None are excluded because of unbelief, except those whose unbelief is *voluntary*, either directly or in

[1] Balmes, l. c., l. 15; C. W. li. 456.

[2] A large number of theologians, certainly the majority, not to say the best authorities among them, affirm that the punishment of original sin consists solely in the privation of supernatural happiness (the sight of God), a happiness, moreover, which is not due man.

St. Thomas maintains that children who die without Baptism not only will not suffer the pain of *sense*, but not even sadness through the pain of the *damned*, that is, through the privation of the beatific vision. Grave theologians admit that these children will enjoy a more or less perfect natural happiness.

its cause. As to those whose unbelief is the result of invincible ignorance, if they are lost, it will not be because they were ignorant of that which it was impossible for them to know.[1]

Nay, more, we are permitted to believe that these men may positively belong to the soul of the Church and consequently be saved, as the Gentiles were before the coming of the Messias. After the example of the Gentiles, they have only to obey the natural law engraven in all hearts, and those primitive traditions, preserved everywhere though frequently altered, concerning God and His providence, the promise of a Redeemer, the rewards and punishments which await man in another life. True, the baptism of water is necessary for all who know of its necessity and who can receive it; but it may be supplied by the *baptism of blood* and the *baptism of desire*. The baptism of blood suffices for it in those who have not attained the use of reason, when they are put to death for the cause of Christ; for this reason the Church celebrates the feast of the Holy Innocents massacred at Bethlehem by King Herod. The baptism of desire suffices for those who, knowing the necessity of the baptism of water and being for any reason whatever unable to receive it, have an explicit desire for it, accompanied by perfect contrition for grave sins. It is even certain that the *implicit desire of baptism*, that is, an act of perfect love of God, for the reason that it implies the will to do whatever God prescribes for salvation, sufficed in the early ages of the Church for unbelievers among whom the Gospel had not yet been preached.

[1] All theologians distinguish negative from positive unbelief. Negative unbelief is not a sin. It is found in persons who do not believe in Revelation because they are ignorant of it through no fault of their own. Positive unbelief is a sin because it is found in those to whom Revelation has been sufficiently revealed and taught. Such persons will certainly be condemned to the suffering of the damned and the pain of sense, for they are guilty of an actual sin of positive unbelief. Muzarrelli, Du Salut des païens. See also Balmes, l. c., l. 16; A. C. Q. ix. 45; I. E. R., Feb. '93.

The Church in fact regards the baptism of water as necessary to salvation only from the period of the *preaching of the Gospel.* This is expressly stated in the Council of Trent. Now the Gospel was, and could be, promulgated only by degrees. Therefore, if there were means of salvation besides Baptism for the unbelievers of that period, because the Gospel had not been announced to them, why should not these same means exist for unbelievers of later centuries who, through no fault of theirs, are in the *same condition?* This is not an article of faith; but we are free to believe it, and the Church does not contradict it. The belief, moreover, is conformable to the doctrine of great theologians, among whom we must count St. Thomas and St. Alphonsus Liguori.[1]

To sum up what we have said, let us observe that Catholic doctrine excludes from salvation for not having embraced

[1] Let us observe also these words of a judicious writer, the Abbé Ant. Pirenne, in his *Études philosophiques sur les principales questions de la religion révélée:* "Let us suppose that a pagan (it is the same with heretics and sectarians) dies loving God *for Himself and above all things,* he is thereby saved. For with charity (supernatural) he has everything: charity of itself justifies. And observe that the smallest degree of charity is sufficient; for the essence of a virtue does not consist in its intensity; a drop of water is as truly water as the ocean, and the quantity of a thing does not influence its nature. Thus charity exists with attachment to venial sin; above all, it may exist without any sensible devotion. You are saved, then, if you leave this life loving God for Himself and above all things that would involve mortal sin. You are saved whatever the circumstances in which you find yourself. If at this supreme moment, pagan, heretic, or schismatic, you receive from God the gift of charity, even a small degree of it which does not take away your attachment to venial sin, you have sufficient for salvation, for charity renders contrition perfect: perfect charity and contrition include the desire, at least implicit desire, for Baptism and confession.

"If we would know in what way charity is communicated to the faithful, here is the reply of Leibnitz, a reply which he has borrowed from Catholic theologians: 'God will give what is necessary to all who do what humanly depends upon them, even if it were necessary to work a miracle.'"

the true faith only those who have been *wilfully* ignorant of revealed truth, that is, who *have not wished to know it*, and those who, having an adequate knowledge of it, have *refused* to embrace it. Those only are *actually* bound to enter the Church who know her to be the necessary means of attaining salvation. Hence the formula "Outside the Church there is no salvation" is in every way rational and logical; and they who cite it against the Church do so in error or bad faith—in error when they misapprehend the precise and full meaning of the axiom, and in bad faith when they refuse to acknowledge it.

But does not the rigor of the Inquisition contradict this reputation for clemency which we would maintain for the Church? The charge is unceasingly repeated in books, journals, periodicals, and pamphlets hostile to our faith. Hence it is necessary to treat separately a question which gives rise to so much malicious declamation.

ART. II.—THE INQUISITION.

This is the great accusation made against the Church by her enemies: the word Inquisition is cast in her face as sentence of condemnation from which there is no appeal.

It is well to remark, first, that, with the exception of a few who are ignorantly deceived or misled, hatred of the Inquisition is confounded with hatred of the Church.

We know the style of argument used by the enemies of this institution in their romances and plays. Their object is to make a vivid impression on the imagination and excite the feelings by a touching picture or a clever dramatic rendering. They take good care not to say that the tortures at which they make us assist, though so contrary to our present customs, were nevertheless conformable in every respect to the penal code of past centuries and to the customs of all the tribunals of those times. With them, the moment that blood flows, that fires are kindled, the cause is judged, and the

tribunal is wrong. They do not reason, they declaim; they do not try to convince minds, but to excite the passions.

This is not the proper method of history: it should be animated by no passion but love of truth. "The first law," says Leo XIII. in a letter in which he strongly recommends historical studies, "is to advance nothing that is false and to shrink from no truth."

Above all things, we must carefully distinguish between the ecclesiastical Inquisition and the Spanish Inquisition.[1]

a. Inquisition means, generally, to search for heretics in order to prevent the spread of their tenets, or to convert them. In this sense the Inquisition dates from the beginning of the Church. It has ever been the bounden duty of popes and bishops to resist heresy, and to prevent its propagation, either by gentle, persuasive measures or by means of chastisements.

b. Nevertheless, by the Inquisition is generally understood a court of justice, both civil and ecclesiastic, called the Holy Office, established to take cognizance of the crime of heresy, and to punish the guilty. This special tribunal dates only from the beginning of the thirteenth century, when it was established by Innocent III. to repress the heresy of the Waldenses and the Albigenses.[2] These sectaries, reproducing the heresy of the Manichæans, spread the spirit of rebellion with their errors, and, resorting to arms, threatened both Church and State. After vain efforts to bring them back to their common duty by instruction and moral suasion, the

[1] Hefele, Life of Card. Ximenes; Parsons, Lies, p. 121 ff.; Studies, II., ch. 31; Balmes, ch. 36, 37. See Maistre; Dwenger; Hergenröther, Catholic Church, etc., vol. ii., Essay 17; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essay 11; Lacordaire, The Order of St. Dominic, ch. 6; Sidney Smith, S.J. (C. T. S. xix); A. C. Q. i. 254, xii. 691, xiii. 385 (on H. Lea's deceiving book), xxv. 531 ff.; M. xlix. 82, lxxiv. 375; D. R. Old Ser. xxviii. 421, New Ser. viii. 53, ix. 163, Apr. 1894, p. 309 (Albigenses); C. C. S. L. ii. p. 7; also references on p. 442.

[2] See Melia's work on the Waldenses; also Parsons, Studies, II.; ch. 25, 27; I. E. R., Nov. '94.

two powers menaced united against the common enemy; it was the duty of the ecclesiastical power to establish, that is to verify, the crime, and of the civil power to administer the punishment. The end of this ecclesiastical Inquisition always was to preserve Catholic nations from the poison of heresy, and States from revolt, which was the usual consequence of heresy. The office of Inquisitor was usually confided to legates or delegates, among whom shone in the first rank the sons of St. Dominick, but only from the year 1223, that is, twelve years after the death of St. Dominick, which fact, however, does not save the saint from being frequently transformed into a Grand Inquisitor.

This Inquisition, born in the bosom of the mother Church of all churches and successively introduced into all parts of the Christian world, is certainly the work of the Roman pontiffs, who have never regretted its establishment.

c. Quite different was the Spanish Inquisition founded by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1481 to protect with the Christian faith the nationality of Spain against the machinations of the Jews and the Moors.[1] In this tribunal also we find two distinct jurisdictions, one of which is exercised by the Church and the other by the civil power. But here the civil power had such a preponderating influence that a number of historians, though inimical to Catholicism, regard the Spanish Inquisition as more political than religious.

Nevertheless we do not pretend to disclaim for the Church all responsibility in the Spanish Inquisition. We acknowledge that Sixtus IV. approved the first thought of the Inquisition in Spain and sanctioned its fundamental statutes. It was from the Holy See that the ecclesiastical inquisitors received their jurisdiction and all their powers. The king, however, received from the Pope the privilege of naming the inquisitors.

Object of the Discussion.—All discussion on the subject

[1] On the persecution of the Jews in Spain see C. W. liv. 360, lv. 649, 851, lviii. 49; see ib. Dec. 1899, "The Popes and the Jews."

of the Inquisition may be reduced to the two following questions, very distinct one from the other.

First Question.—Was the institution of this tribunal lawful in principle and moral right?

Second Question.—Do the proceedings of the Inquisition as known to us through history merit the condemnation with which our enemies would brand them, and can they be made a charge against the Church?

Let us not forget that in all this discussion there is no question of unbelievers, pagans or Jews, over which the Church has no jurisdiction, but only of Christians, that is, of those whom the regeneration of Baptism made amenable to the laws of the Church. The first, says St. Thomas, certainly should not be forced to obey the Church; the others, on the contrary, should: *contra vero, alteri sunt cogendi.*

I. Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle.

A. On the Part of the Church.—There can be no doubt of this in the mind of a Catholic. Popes and councils, saints and doctors, Scripture and tradition proclaim that the Church has the right, and that it is also her duty, to watch over the purity of the faith, and to inflict penalties, even corporal penalties, on her children who wander from the faith and become a stone of stumbling to their brethren.[1] This unde-

[1] In the light of Catholic dogma it is always a crime in an adult Catholic "to wander from the faith." The Church teaches (*a*) that faith is an imperative duty of man towards God, as without faith it is impossible to please God; (*b*) that this faith is a supernatural gift of God which man, once he has received it, cannot lose except by his own free will; (*c*) that she herself is the divinely appointed and infallible teacher of revealed truth, which is the proper object of divine faith; (*d*) that there cannot possibly be any reason whatever of denying this faith once professed; (*e*) that consequently to wander from the Catholic faith is a most grievous sin against God and against His holy Church.

From this it follows evidently that the Catholic Church alone can *consistently* claim the right of punishing apostasy from her faith,

niable right, which flows from the powers which Jesus Christ has conferred upon her, the Church has always exercised; she has always considered the crimes of heresy, of apostasy, and of sacrilege as deserving of punishment as outrages upon the honor, the property, or the life of a fellow being. This doctrine and this conduct of the Church are perfectly reasonable and lawful. In fact it is the right and duty of every society to provide for the salvation of its members and to watch over its own preservation. Without this right it could not exist. The Church, a perfect society, provided by her divine Founder with all that is necessary for her preservation and her propagation, possesses this right then, and can, in consequence, make laws and punish those of her subjects who do not observe them. If they are recalcitrant and contumacious, *devios et contumaces*, according to the expression of Benedict XIV., the Church, like a tender but firm mother, exercises her right, and fulfils her duty by correcting them, in order that chastisement may bring them back to the right path, and prevent others from being led away by their pernicious example. She acts in this respect like the father of a family who takes wise and efficacious measures to correct his children and to preserve his home from anything of a nature to disturb its peace and happiness. Her course is analogous to that of the governments of the present day when they adopt vigorous precautions to prevent the entrance of pestilence, cholera, or any epidemic whatever, or when they establish a corps of special agents to seek out malefactors, conspirators, assassins, and hand them over to the vengeance of the law, and prevent the execution of their nefarious designs.

The Inquisition was in religious society what parental discipline is in the family, what health boards, police boards, medical corps, and tribunals of justice are in civil society, that

and that no State can *consistently* put heresy on its criminal code unless it professes the Catholic faith.—Editor.

is, a means of conservation for itself and of preservation for its members.

B. On the Part of the State.—When we wish to judge the lawfulness of an institution we must transport ourselves to the time when it was established. It is well known that at the period of the Inquisition European society was profoundly Christian; the people were as universally convinced of the truth of Catholic dogma as we, *in our modern societies*, can be of the truth of the principles of the natural law; hence revolt against God was justly regarded as no less treasonable than revolt against the king.

Rulers and people, accepting Catholic faith as the only true and divine religion, considered its preservation of paramount importance to all natural advantages. The legislation of the various countries of Europe was founded upon an intimate union of Church and State. Consequently every *overt* act of disobedience to the laws of religion was punishable by the civil law. Human law cannot, of course, enter the secret domain of *conscience*, accessible only to God; it cannot prescribe *interior acts* or punish violations which are not exterior.

Under such circumstances nothing could be more natural than the *establishment of tribunals* the office of which was to discover, by lawful and honest means, exterior violations of the religious law, to discern between obstinate heretics and those who were only misled for a time, to punish the real criminals and proclaim the innocence of others. Such tribunals were as lawful as the tribunals of the present day established to judge offences against the State, or the person, reputation, or property of citizens.

It was because they were penetrated with these truths that Theodosius the Great, Justinian, Charlemagne, Otho the Great, Louis IX., and all civilized rulers and nations considered it no violation of liberty to punish heresy or apostasy.

Conclusion.—In a society formed according to the prin-

ciples and based upon the legislation we have described, no one could reasonably deny that the Church acted in all wisdom in establishing in concert with the civil power, to which she referred the chastisement of culprits, a tribunal for discerning the real criminal with greater guarantees of justice, and taking cognizance of an offence regarded as one of the gravest against both the social and the religious order.

If there are those who have any difficulty in accepting this conclusion, it is because we live in an atmosphere steeped in error. The enemies of the Church, to favor the propagation of evil and for their own safety, never cease to hold up every attempt to repress impiety and heresy, as an outrage upon what they falsely call the sacred rights of conscience.

It is nevertheless incontestable that no one has the right to do evil, that no one has, or can have, as it is claimed at the present day, a natural and imprescriptible right to think, to write, and to propagate whatever he pleases. Created by God and dependent upon Him for all things, man has no right to outrage and blaspheme the Author of his existence. Made a child of the Church by baptism, he has no right to revolt against his Mother. Member of a society, he has no right to break down the foundations upon which this society rests. Endowed with free-will to do good meritoriously, he has no right to abuse this faculty by corrupting his brethren and leading them to evil.

It is no less incontestable that there are errors which are criminal. Yes, there are perversions of reason which cannot practically be distinguished from moral perversions. Man is obliged, above all things, to cling to truth, and to preserve his intelligence from error; this is evident, since to will it is necessary to know, and to will righteously we must know the truth. If there were no rule for thought, there could be none for actions. What would then become of morals and of society? Among culpable errors, sins of incredulity, heresy, and apostasy rank first. In fact there is no outrage upon the honor, the life, the property of man, a simple creature,

which ranks in enormity with those monstrous crimes which directly attack the Creator Himself. To refuse obstinately to believe in the revelation of God, when adequately known and demonstrated, is a crime of treason against the Divine Majesty, for it is, in a measure, denying the infinite truth of God. Now at the time and in the countries where the Inquisition reigned it was easy for all to have a complete moral certainty (proportioned to the condition and development of each mind) of the divinity of the Christian religion, and of the Catholic Church.[1]

II. The Proceedings of the Inquisition.

We have just proved that the Inquisition was lawful in principle; that in the times and in the countries where it was established it was lawful to adopt rigorous measures against the propagation of religious errors. But is there nothing censurable in the way in which this right was exercised, was it not exercised with cruelty? This is the question to be examined at present. We shall reply to it with the aid of a few remarks.

First Remark.—Let us observe, first of all, that this question is by no means as important as the first. It would, in fact, be absurd to hold the Church responsible for abuses of which the judges in the Inquisition may have been guilty. Just as a man can be reasonably held responsible only for the effects and results of his personal actions, in like manner a social body can be charged only with what is the result of its existence, of its social action, or, in other words, of its constituent principles, of its laws, and the regular exercise of authority. Would it be just to attribute to civil laws or to military regulations abuses of authority connected with these laws and regulations, but condemned by them? Now the abuses with which the Inquisition is charged are far from being the fruit of the principles of Catholicism: they are even

[1] See also, on Tolerance, references p. 442.

opposed to its spirit, and were in fact severely condemned by the sovereign Pontiffs each time they were brought to their knowledge.

Second Remark.—We must also bear in mind that the judges charged to pronounce penal sentence for the crime of heresy were civil judges; the ecclesiastical authority confined itself to establishing the crime. The severe, the terrible punishments, particularly the capital, were administered by the government, of whom an account should be required when there is occasion for censure. We have seen, moreover, that a Christian and Catholic State, in lending the Church the assistance of the secular arm, was only fulfilling a duty: protecting the imprescriptible rights of truth and removing all that endangered the capital interests of society. Moreover, the clemency which played so important a rôle in the sentences of the Inquisition is the work of the Church, which had no part in the punishments except to repress them, to mitigate them, or to recommend the culprits to the indulgence of the judge.[1] Hence the reputation for mildness which the ecclesiastical tribunals enjoyed. It was this reputation for clemency which induced the Templars at the time of their celebrated trial to ask expressly to be judged by the ecclesiastical Inquisition; they knew, historians tell us, that if they went before such judges they would not be sentenced to capital punishment. But Philip le Bel, whose mind was already made up, and who knew the inevitable consequence of recourse to this tribunal, shut himself up with his state council and summarily condemned the Templars to death.[2]

Moreover, if the spirit of the Church is a spirit of mildness we must expect to see it especially manifested at Rome. Hence we find Clement IV. reproaching St. Louis himself with the excessive severity of the laws which the great monarch had made against blasphemers, and earnestly begging him in his bull of 1208 to mitigate them. And in our own

[1] Hefele, Life of Ximenes, ch. 18.

[2] Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 35; D. R., Oct. '95, p. 329.

day nowhere are Jews better treated than in Rome, so much so that it has passed into a proverb that the city of the popes is the paradise of the Jews. In Germany, where there was a number of ecclesiastical sovereigns, a similar proverb existed: "It is good to live under the cross." "Never," says Joseph de Maistre, "was there in these peaceful governments any question of capital punishment or persecution of the enemies of the reigning powers."

THIRD REMARK.—It is a mark of strange historical ignorance or singular audacity in calumny to represent cruel sufferings and instruments of torture as belonging distinctly and exclusively to the Inquisition. Yet we find this stated constantly in anti-religious books and journals. Such punishments were in fact universal. It could be easily proved that the tribunals of the Inquisition were generally much more just and much less severe toward the accused than all the civil tribunals of the period.[1] Hefele, even accepting the data of the partial historian Llorente, furnishes such proof in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, the most decried of all.[2] If we would form an idea of the character of the civil tribunals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we ought to read the learned memoir of M. Poullet, professor in the University of Louvain: *Histoire du droit penal dans le duché de Brabant*, etc. Here is a passage from it: "The greatest diversity, uncertainty, and arbitrariness reigned in all the proceedings. The accused was deprived of the precious guarantee of a public trial; the judge could, if he chose, refuse counsel to the defendant, nor was the latter allowed to be present during the examination of witnesses." The

[1] The enemies of the Inquisition rely chiefly upon the testimony of Llorente. To be convinced of the little reliance to be placed on this writer it is sufficient to know that he destroyed the original documents upon which he claimed to have based his work, hoping thus to render it impossible to control or confute his assertions. See Stone, A Brief for the Spanish Inquisition; Balmes, p. 456.

[2] See Hefele's Life of Cardinal Ximenes, which contains much that is interesting in regard to the Inquisition of Spain.

same writer, speaking of the penalties, says: "The general system breathed only intimidation and public vengeance. The penalty of death was frequently accompanied with a series of revolting cruelties, the judges endeavoring to graduate capital punishment according to the various degrees of guilt in the delinquent. Below capital punishment there were only corporal punishments, frequently irreparable, always degrading. Nothing was done to reform the criminal or to inspire him with better sentiments before returning him to social life. Detention was used only as a punishment and for slight offences. It had no place in the penal system, properly speaking, and was never inflicted when the judge had to repress a really grave violation or offence."

What is said here of the criminal laws of Brabant applies to the rest of Europe. It was a time when counterfeiters were burned alive, when those who used false weights and measures were scourged with rods or condemned to death; burglary led to the gallows; those convicted a second time of theft were also punished with death. To form an idea of the excessive severity of the civil tribunals of that period it is sufficient to read the Caroline Penal Code of Charles V., which governed the German empire until the last century.

Fourth Remark.—The use of torture is made an accusation against the Inquisition. Who does not know that torture was used in *all the tribunals* of Europe as a means of discovering the truth?

There is a curious incident relative to this in the memoir of M. Poullet. He says that in 1765 and 1766 the Belgian Council were consulted by Charles de Lorraine concerning certain reforms to be made in the Criminal Code, notably the eventual abolition of torture. The *whole Council* voted for preserving it, and on being consulted again, a few years later, maintained their first opinion.

Let us observe also that the Inquisition abandoned the use of torture before the other tribunals of Europe. "It is certain," says Llorente, "that the Inquisition had long ceased

to use torture." Moreover, contrary to the custom of all civil tribunals, it never permitted torture to be used a second time during the same trial, and it required that a physician be present to determine the moment when the life of a criminal was in danger.

FIFTH REMARK.—In regard to the Spanish Inquisition in particular, we have no difficulty in recognizing that there were abuses. How could it be otherwise when here, as elsewhere, men were judges? At the same time it is important to bear in mind that:

a. The tribunal was more an institution of the State than of the Church, and its members followed, not the instructions of the popes, but the prescriptions of temporal princes. As to the abuses with which it may be lawfully charged, the Church was the first to condemn them. The popes protested against excessive severity, and they even went so far as to grant those condemned by the royal tribunal the right of appealing to a special ecclesiastical judge. Later, finding that the royal judges did not respect this right of appeal, the sovereign Pontiff granted all condemned the right to claim the interference of the Holy See. Spanish inquisitors were even excommunicated despite the wrath of princes.

In a word, the Church used every influence in her power to induce rulers and judges to imitate the example of her gentleness and moderation. Therefore nothing is more unjust and unreasonable than to hold the Papacy or the Church responsible for excesses committed by the Spanish tribunals.

b. It has been proved that the cruelties attributed to the Spanish Inquisition have been exaggerated beyond measure and with signal bad faith. Llorente himself, though so hostile to the Church, acknowledges that the dungeons of the Inquisition were dry, high-vaulted apartments, palaces in fact, compared with the prisons of the other tribunals of Europe; and that no prisoner of the Inquisition ever wore chains or an iron collar. M. Bourgoing, ambassador to Spain, does not

hesitate to say, in his *Tableau de l'Espagne moderne:* "I acknowledge, in justice to truth, that the Inquisition might be cited at the present day as a model of equity."

c. But there is nothing which inspires the ill-instructed with greater horror than the thought of the *autos da fé.* They are usually represented as horrible scenes: a huge caldron large enough to burn a multitude of victims, surrounded by a crowd of fanatics, among whom figure prominently the implacable judges of the Holy Office, contemplating with fierce joy a spectacle worthy of cannibals.

The truth is an *auto da fé,* that is, an *act of faith,* did not consist in burning or putting to death, but in acquitting persons falsely accused, or reconciled with the Church. In fact this tribunal, like the tribunal of penance, absolved the *repentant.* Only obstinate heretics, as well as those whose offences were partly of a civil character, were handed over to the secular arm. After this absolution the *auto da fé* was finished and the ecclesiastical judge withdrew.

d. It is frequently alleged that the number of victims immolated in a brief period by the Spanish Inquisition may be estimated by hundreds of thousands; now a list furnished by this same Llorente estimates the number of victims during the three hundred and thirty-one years of the Inquisition at about thirty-five thousand, and this list includes criminals of various categories, who were also amenable to these tribunals; for example, smugglers, magicians or sorcerers, usurers; and even then the list is manifestly exaggerated; for if Llorente is to be believed, in regard to the *autos da fé* of Toledo of February 12th, May 1st, and December 10th, 1486, the number of victims was respectively seven hundred, nine hundred, and seven hundred and fifty, but in reality there was not in this number a *single victim:* it is a list of criminals, not of executions.[1]

[1] Let us add a word in comparison with what was taking place at the same time in Protestant countries. At Nuremberg, one of the most enlightened cities of Germany, of the 50,000 souls who formed

Comparing the much-decried severity of the Spanish Inquisition with the cruelty of Elizabeth of England, William Cobbett, a Protestant author, affirms that this sanguinary queen put more persons to death in one year than the Inquisition did during the whole period of its existence. Moreover, we have seen that the intolerance of Protestants toward Catholics was everywhere much more violent than that of Catholics toward heretics; the Lutheran princes tore their subjects from the Church by a *bloody persecution.* And yet it is only against the Catholic Church that the charge of persecution is made.

Sixth Remark.—It is just to judge the tree by its fruit, and to meet the charges against the Inquisition with the salutary results it produced. It cannot be disputed that it was owing in a great measure to this institution that many of the countries of Europe preserved the faith intact during centuries, and were preserved particularly from the baneful invasion of intolerant and sanguinary Protestantism.

Spain, particularly, owes the Inquisition a large debt of gratitude for the preservation of unity of faith, and for preserving the country from the civil wars which devastated so many other countries. Even Voltaire, the great enemy of the Inquisition as well as of the Church, says: "In Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were

the judiciary district, 356 perished on the scaffold in forty years (1577–1617). To keep pace with this the Spanish Inquisition would have had to execute 56,960 persons in the same period of time. At Nördlingen, which counted 6000 inhabitants, 35 sorcerers were burned in four years (1590–1594). If the Inquisition had exercised the same rigor, it would have burned during the same lapse of time 46,500 sorcerers, that is, 11,000 more than the total number of those who, condemned for *all kinds* of crimes, received capital punishment during the whole time of its existence. This was the alleged exceptional rigor of the Spanish Inquisition. (On the famous trials for *Witchcraft* see Hergenröther, Ch. and St., ii., Essay 16, p. 2; D. R. xxx. 331; Birkhauser, Ch. Hist., pp. 473, 722, note; Parsons, vi. 534; Spalding, M. J., Miscell., I., ch. 20; M., July 1902; U. B., July 1896, p. 361; A. C. Q., July 1902.

none of those bloody revolutions, those conspiracies, and those cruel punishments which were witnessed in the other courts of Europe. . . . Kings were not assassinated as in France, and did not perish by the hand of the executioner as in England." "Look," says Joseph de Maistre, "at the Thirty Years' War enkindled by the arguments of Luther, the unheard-of excesses of the Anabaptists and the Peasants; the civil wars of France, England, and Flanders; the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the massacre of Merindol and of Cévennes; the assassination of Mary Stuart, Henry III., Henry IV., Charles I., Prince of Orange, etc. The blood shed by the reformers would float a vessel. The Inquisition, at most, shed only the blood of these murderers. They need not tell us, therefore, that the Inquisition produced this abuse and that abuse; for that is not the question, but rather whether, during the last three centuries, Spain, in virtue of the Inquisition, did not enjoy more peace and happiness than the other countries of Europe."

"The Inquisition has been reproached," says the same writer, "with its darkening influence on the human mind, but the finest period of Spanish literature was the reign of Philip II. . . . It is vain to reiterate that genius is chained when forbidden to attack national dogmas; error can never be established by force of repetition."[1]

Seventh Remark.—We would make a final remark to calm the vain terrors which certain men like to excite. Though the Church, as we have seen, has an incontestable right to punish heretics, though she used this right when she judged it fitting, yet she is not obliged to use it always, she must even renounce the exercise of it when it becomes impossible or injurious. Thus the Church has in reality long since abandoned it, and the Inquisition remains only as a historical memory and a bugbear in the service of ignorance and impiety. Those who affect to tremble at the recollection of it have no reason to fear. The secular arm

[1] Robinson, W. C., Philip II. and his Vindication.

is not suspended by the Church above their heads. Would to Heaven Catholics were equally secure from the blows of a secular arm of scant tolerance!

ART. III.—THE TRIAL OF GALILEO.[1]

This is another weapon of attack valued by the enemies of the Church, for the reason that, in their opinion, it proves the fallibility of the Church and the Pope, and their opposition to scientific progress. Let us see if the accusation is well founded.

HISTORICAL NOTICE.—Galileo (1564–1642), a learned astronomer and distinguished philosopher, was born at Pisa, but lived at Florence. He adopted at the beginning of the sixteenth century the opinion of the Canon Copernicus (1473–1543), which held that the earth moved around a stationary sun. But while Copernicus was allowed to teach his theory undisturbed, Galileo was indirectly censured the 24th of February, 1616, by the Holy Office.

No book of Galileo is condemned in this censure pronounced by the Holy Office, but the *Copernican doctrine* in regard to the mobility of the earth and the immobility of the sun is declared to be philosophically false, contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and formally heretical. This censure was an act of a private nature in which no one but the consultors of the Roman Congregation were concerned. Therefore it excited no discussion. The following Thursday the Pope, on the report of the Cardinals of the Holy Office, ordered that Galileo be notified of this censure and that he be forbidden to teach the doctrine of the mobility of the earth. The order contains *no word* of Paul V. which could be construed as qualifying the doctrine; moreover, this again was merely a personal document having nothing

[1] Wegg-Prosser; Parsons, Studies, IV.; Lies, p. 80; A. C. Q. vi. 85; C. W. viii., xlvi. 110; D. R. New Ser. xvi. 351, xvii. 140, III. Ser. ii. 236; I. E. R., Apr. 1900.

in common with an *ex cathedra* definition. Then followed the decree of the Index of March 5, 1616, which prohibited *the books* written in favor of the system of Copernicus. The Pope's name does not appear in the decree: the Congregation spoke in its own name. No penance or abjuration followed on the part of Galileo, who continued to live in his villa near Florence, enjoying the friendship and favors of Urban VIII. Finally, in 1633 a sentence was issued condemning Galileo to retract what were called his errors. It simply stated the culpability of Galileo and fixed the penalties he was to endure. The decree of 1616 was referred to only as an historical fact. "The Sacred Congregation of the Index," it ran, "has rendered a decree in which the books which treat of this doctrine were prohibited, and the doctrine itself declared false and contrary to the Scriptures." There is no trace in it of the public intervention of the sovereign Pontiff, either in qualifying as heretical the heresy attributed to the Copernican system, or in the examination and condemnation of Galileo.

We see even from this brief statement of the case that the only important decree from a doctrinal point of view is that of March 5, 1616, which attributes to the words of the Bible a meaning which we know now the text does not bear out. What are we to think of this decree?

I. The Decree of 1616 and the Infallibility of the Church.

This question is as simple as it is incontestable: the decree of 1616 is not one of those sentences to which the Church attributes the privilege of infallibility. In effect:

1. We have already seen (p. 409) what conditions are necessary to render the doctrinal teaching of the sovereign Pontiff infallible: he must speak *ex cathedra*, that is, in the discharge of his office as pastor and doctor of all Christians he must define, in virtue of his supreme

apostolic authority, that a doctrine concerning faith or morals is to be believed by the whole Church. Now, the incriminating decree of 1616 lacks the characters required by the Vatican Council: it imposes no adherence to any doctrine, it merely *prohibits the books* which teach the mobility of the earth and the immobility of the sun; nor does it insist that the last opinion shall be held as false and the first as true. It prescribes what must be *done*, not what must be *believed*. In brief, no doctrine is imposed as of faith upon the whole Church; it is only a *disciplinary* enactment to prevent the spread of certain books. It is true that the *considerations* which precede the decree and which express the motive dictating it, contain a doctrinal error; in effect the theory of the movement of the earth is neither false nor contrary to Holy Scripture; but the *decision* itself does not go beyond a *disciplinary* enactment. Therefore, even if the decree of 1616 contained an infallible definition of doctrine, the considerations, as we have seen (ibid.), would not necessarily partake of this infallibility.

2. To this decisive proof let us add that the very form of the decree fully confirms what we say. In all the doctrinal definitions emanating from the Holy See and recognized as infallible, the *Pope* always teaches directly and not through the cardinals. There is not a single example of a doctrinal definition generally recognized as infallible which was rendered in the form of the decree concerning Galileo.

3. Still another argument of great value is that contemporary documents prove that the *Pope* himself and the persons of his court *never considered* the decree in question an infallible definition. Nor did the theologians of the time or those who followed them: not one can be cited who regarded this decree as definitive and infallible; a number, on the contrary, could be named who categorically declared the contrary. Their names and their statements can be found in the works or articles referred to, especially Wegg-

Prosser and Parsons. Finally, the idea of regarding the decree as an *ex cathedra* definition never occurred even to Galileo's bitterest opponents, though such a definition would have afforded them the best means of dealing a decisive blow to his theories.

Remarks.—1st. We have no difficulty in acknowledging that the Roman Congregation erred in their much-to-be-regretted condemnation of Galileo; carried away by their extravagant fondness for Aristotle and the philosophic system of his commentators, they made the mistake of imagining that religion was endangered and Holy Scripture contradicted by the system of Copernicus.

It is also true that Pope Urban VII. himself took an active part in this erroneous judgment; but his responsibility is wholly individual, wholly personal: it tells against the scholar, the private theologian, but not against the sovereign Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*, that is, as sovereign teacher of the universal Church. In fact all that theology requires to constitute an *ex cathedra* decree is altogether lacking here: the Pope not only made no solemn declaration, but no bull, no encyclical, nor even a brief of the Holy Father accompanied the sentence of the Holy Office of the Congregation of the Index; nor was any confirmation or signature asked of the sovereign Pontiff. And even such confirmation would not be sufficient to pledge his infallibility.

2d. Though the system of Copernicus was true, Galileo did not know how to defend it, and it is not astonishing that the weak arguments with which he tried to establish his theory excited violent contradiction. Moreover, if ecclesiastical tribunals were deceived, scholars could not boast of greater perspicacity, for numbers of them fell into the same error, and, what is more, desired and urged the condemnation of Galileo. Hence science was no less at fault than theology. We might add that Luther, Melanchthon, and the reformers generally showed no more tolerance for the new system.

3d. If Galileo after his condemnation of 1616 had been more prudent and less aggressive,[1] he would not have received a second condemnation in 1633, and it is probable that the system of Copernicus would soon have become popular, for it had as partisans and defenders among the clergy a number of renowned scholars. Unfortunately he had not patience to trust the inevitable triumph of his ideas to time, and he wrote a new work entitled "Dialogues on the Two Systems of the World," in which he attacked those among his adversaries who had been most indulgent toward him. The Pope, particularly, believed himself insulted in the ridiculous character of Simplicio. The partisans of the Ptolemaic system, incensed by Galileo's conduct, asked and obtained a new condemnation, which, however, did not receive, any more than that of 1616, the authentic or public confirmation of the sovereign Pontiff.

4th. No Catholic attributes the privilege of infallibility to the Roman Congregations. They are subject to err, no doubt; but this is not to say that they have no authority and that their decrees may be defied. The father of a family also may be mistaken, but he does not on that account lose his right to the obedience of his children. Instituted to examine doctrinal questions, and to watch over the purity of the faith, these congregations have the right to forbid the teaching of certain doctrines considered by them as erroneous, suspicious, or dangerous. Such prohibition is a measure of prudence, and is binding upon Catholics; at the same time it is essentially *provisory* in its nature. If, therefore, it is proved later that the danger does not exist, or that it has ceased, the prohibition will be removed, or cease of itself to exist for lack of cause.

Conclusion.—It is manifestly evident from the facts stated above that the infallibility of the Church does not enter into the questions of Galileo's condemnation; we have reason, on the contrary, to recognize in it the providential assistance

[1] Dr. Whewell, History of Inductive Science, vol. i., p. 420.

promised to the Church, when we consider that though numerous theologians and possibly the Pope himself regarded the Copernican system as contrary to the Holy Scripture, God did not permit the head of the Church to pronounce against it a judgment *ex cathedra*.

II. Was Galileo a Martyr to Science?

This second point is much less important than the first. It implies both a question of principle and one of fact: is the Church opposed to science, and did Galileo have to suffer for his scientific conviction ?

1. So far from being opposed to the progress of science, the Church has always stimulated intellectual activity; she has always favored philosophy, belles-lettres, the sciences, and the arts. This we have already proved, and we demonstrate it still further in Chapter V.

In regard to the systematic and malicious opposition to the progress of natural science attributed to the clergy at the time of Galileo, it is clearly denied by the striking testimony of the sympathy and protection then accorded to scientific studies at Rome; by the remarkable labors of the Jesuits Clavius, Griemberger, Guldin, Scheiner, Grimaldi, Riccioli; of the canons or monks, like Copernicus, Castelli, Renieri, Cavalieri, Gassendi, and by the enthusiastic reception which the discoveries of Galileo met with in the highest circles of Rome; by his intimacy and active correspondence with a number of prelates such as Cardinals Barberini and Conti, Mgr. Dini, Mgr. Ciampoli, the Archbishop Piccolomini, Mgr. Virginio Cesarini.

Morover, the system of Aristarchus of Samos (third century before Christ), which held that the earth revolved about the sun, was freely taught without any protest on the part of the Church. In 1435 Cardinal Cusa revived this system; then Canon Copernicus in his immortal work *De orbium cœlestium*

revolutionibus had completely transformed it and applied it to the discussion of heavenly appearances; his work had obtained the support of Cardinal Schomberg and the approbation of Pope Paul III.; the new doctrine was taught in the Italian schools and professed before the sovereign Pontiff Clement VII., and no authorized protest was ever heard within the Church.

2. To stimulate the hatred of the opponents of religion an attempt has been made to represent Galileo as a martyr to science, thrust into a dark dungeon and delivered up to the horrors of torture. The truth is that from 1616 to 1633 he peacefully continued his labors at Florence, where he wrote the works we have mentioned. In regard to the period of the second trial, it was proved by the testimony of all contemporaries most worthy of belief, as well as by the correspondence of Galileo himself, and the written proceedings of the trial of 1633, that he not only was not tortured and was not a martyr to science, but that, strictly speaking, he was never imprisoned or deprived of his liberty either before or after his sentence. "We defy the most fanatical," says M. Gilbert in *La Revue des Questions scientifiques* (1877), "to state when and where, during or after his trial, Galileo endured an hour's detention in a real prison." While his trial was pending he lived at the palace of Nicolini, the Tuscan ambassador, his devoted friend, who overwhelmed him with attention; on the eve of his examination he was taken to the Minerva, where he remained from the 12th to the 13th of April, 1633, in the apartments of the judge-advocate of the Holy Office, with permission "to wander in the vast chambers," as Galileo himself writes, and had the services not only of his own servant, but of those of the ambassador. "As to my health, I am well, thanks to God and the delicate attention of the ambassador and his wife, who are most attentive in affording me every comfort." Having fallen ill, he was sent back by order of Pope Urban VIII. to the palace of the ambassador, where he was allowed to receive his friends,

and to go and come as he pleased. He remained in this brilliant prison until June 22d, the day of his condemnation. By the judicial sentence he was to be detained at the apartments of the fiscal of the Holy Office; but the next day this detention was changed to retirement at the palace of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Later, after a sojourn with his devoted friend the Archbishop of Sienna, Galileo passed the rest of his life at his own villa at Arcetri, which had been assigned him for his permanent residence. Here he continued his scientific work and received the visits of the learned and prominent persons of his time. He died in 1642, having drawn to the last day of his life the pension allowed him by the Pope in 1630.

3. In regard to the *torture* which, it is claimed, was inflicted upon the illustrious astronomer, no confirmation of it is found in the authentic and complete records published by M. de l'Epinois, which give the fullest details of the trial. "Never did Galileo in letters to his most intimate correspondents ever write a line from which it could be inferred that he was subjected to torture. It is true that in his final examination the learned Florentine was *menaced* with torture, but it is equally certain that the menace was, and could be, only a mere formality." The inquisitorial proceeding did not allow the actual use of the torture in the case of old men and the sick. Now Galileo was sixty-nine years old and suffering from grave sickness. He himself declares in a letter of 1634 that "he suffered nothing in his life or honor." See M. Gilbert's article already quoted.

It was only about 1770, that is, one hundred and forty years after the trial, that Italian writers began to circulate the report that Galileo was put to the torture, acknowledging at the same time that it was improbable. Now that we possess the official documents of the trial, such a calumny is absolutely untenable; hence it is never cited by reliable writers, whatever the school to which they belong. We

cannot hope, however, to see it disappear from the writings hostile to religion.[1]

Let us observe in passing that the famous *e pur si muove*, "nevertheless it moves," attributed to Galileo as he rose from his knees after his abjuration, is a *pure invention*. For the rest this story began to circulate only at the end of the last century. Writers will continue nevertheless to quote it as true, because of its fine effect in a romance or play.

Conclusion.—The enemies of the Church must be very poor in arguments against her to repeat constantly this oft-refuted error of an ecclesiastic tribunal. The error, unique in its kind, was shared by a number of scholars, and is readily explained by the circumstances of the times in which it occurred. Their persistent use of this question, more than two hundred years old, as a powerful weapon against the Church, is all the more singular since Galileo himself, to whose opinion a number of cardinals and priests rallied, was not an apostate, not a free-thinker, but a sincere and honest Catholic; the rudest trials failed to shake his faith, and he died piously in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

ART. IV.—THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW AND THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

1. Historical Notice.—In 1572, on the eve of the feast of St. Bartholomew,[2] Charles IX., yielding to the insistence of Catharine de Medici, his mother, gave order for the massacre of Admiral Coligny and the other Huguenot leaders living in Paris or who had recently come to assist at the marriage of the King of Navarre with Margaret of Valois. The populace of Paris had long regarded the Hu-

[1] On Giordano Bruno, another so-called martyr of science, see J. Mooney, Who was G. B.?; A. C. Q. xiv. 716; M. lxvi. 357, lxxv. 527; Parsons, Studies, III., ch. 31; Lies, p. 33.

[2] Parsons, Lies, p. 221; Studies, III., ch. 23; Laughnan, S.J. (C. T. S. xvii., xx.); C. W. viii., xli. 813, xlii. 254; M. lxxvii. 175; D. R. New Ser. iv. 281.

guenots with hatred; they had not forgotten the promise of the pillage of the capital made by the reformers to the crafty followers recruited in Germany. Thus, when excited by the sight of the blood shed on this memorable night by the emissaries of the king, they rose in their turn, and venting their rage upon the Protestants, put them to the sword before any authority could quell their violence or arrest the carnage. From the 25th of August to the 30th of October similar massacres took place in several other cities of the kingdom.

We have no need to examine this event here from a historical point of view. We shall find it most carefully treated in M. Kervyn's beautiful work, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux*. The minute researches of this historian, who advances nothing which is not supported by authentic documents, throws great light on this terrible drama. Our duty is to demonstrate that there is not the shadow of foundation for holding religion responsible for this event. If there ever was anything clearly demonstrated by the most incontestable documents, it is that *the St. Bartholomew massacre was a purely political event;* religion had no part in it, neither was it the agent or pretext, nor did it counsel it. No cardinal, no bishop, no priest took part in the deliberations concerning the massacre, any more than in its execution.

It is true that at the news of this terrible stroke of state policy Gregory XIII. had solemn thanksgiving offered to God, went in procession to the churches of St. Mark and St. Louis, and had a medal struck commemorative of the occasion. But we know what was the real and only object of this demonstration: the court of Valois sent word to the Pope that a terrible conspiracy against the throne had been happily discovered and frustrated. Similar notices were sent to the provinces of the kingdom and to all the Christian courts. Later, when the whole truth was known, the sovereign Pontiff in his discourses and in his bulls publicly manifested his horror at the crime which had been perpetrated.

We cannot hope, however, to see the enemies of the Church relinquish this weapon. Despite the refutations of learned Protestants themselves, they persist in affirming that the ministers of Catharine de Medici's vengeance were animated by religious hatred; and the better to excite the passions they continue, with Voltaire and a celebrated modern opera, to mingle crucifixes with poignards, and to represent the cardinal Charles de Lorraine, who was in Rome at the time, as blessing in Paris the poignards destined for the massacre.

Remarks.—1st. It may be well to observe that the number of victims in the massacre has been singularly exaggerated. It is impossible to get at the exact truth on this point: the figures of the historians differ, but it has been established as very probable that the number of victims did not exceed two thousand—an enormous figure, no doubt, but considerably less than the thirty thousand quoted by certain authors, and particularly the one hundred thousand hazarded by Péréfixe. What confidence, moreover, can be placed in accounts where palpable contradictions meet one at every step? The Martyrology published by the Calvinists in 1582 speaks of 15,168 victims, but names only 786. Yet the author had every reason to magnify this number; he wrote, moreover, at a time when the crime was fresh and vivid in all minds; and as his list contains only names of very little importance, we may believe that he gathered every item that could increase the number of the martyrs and swell the volume of the martyrology.

2d. Nor is there any proof that the massacre had been long premeditated; the contrary seems to be well established. M. Kervyn de Lettenhove sums up his opinion on the subject as follows: "That Catharine de Medici carefully prepared the assassination of Coligny there is no possible doubt; no doubt she secretly desired to be rid of all those whom, she thought, she had any reason to fear, and particularly the Huguenots, who at this time gave her much anxiety. According to her own expression she desired to profit by

a favorable occasion, *del caso*. All contemporary testimony disproves the existence of premeditation in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which, in face of an execrable conspiracy, was only a defence which, though still more execrable, was judged necessary." (t. II. ch. xxxii.)

The historian concludes the same chapter thus: "Such was this bloody day of St. Bartholomew, which, though studied at times inaccurately as regards its causes and its phases, adds a new blot, more odious than all the others, to the ambition and craft of Catharine de Medici. In a few hours the Huguenots, from the rôle of conspirators passed as victims into history, and the queen mother, at a time when she had every lawful weapon at hand, chose to use those which will dishonor her memory forever."

2. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. has also become a theme of denunciations and accusations; absurd as they are, they impress the ignorant, and pass from mouth to mouth without examination. The principles previously established in regard to the relations which should exist between Church and State, and the facts attested by impartial history, completely refute them, however.[1]

Historical Notice.—Henry IV. by his edict of 1598 had granted the Huguenots not only liberty of conscience, but also much liberty of worship and great privileges. Thus he stipulated that they should be eligible to all civil offices and employments in the kingdom; that a sum of one hundred and forty thousand pounds should be paid annually for the maintenance of the ministers of the reformed religion; that all the places, cities, and palaces, to the number of 121, occupied by the Huguenots should be protected by a guard of their own adherents, and the garrison paid by the

[1] Parsons, IV., ch. 11; Spalding, J. M., History of the Reformation, II., ch. 8; Stang, More about the Huguenots; Laughnan, S.J. (C. T. S. xx., and in M. lxxvi. 70, 234); A. C. Q. xix. 273; D. R., July 1893, p. 599, Oct. 1894, p. 358; C. W., April 1898.

king. This was nothing less, as Henry IV. himself said to Sully, than the creation of a republican State in the heart of France. By an edict of the 22d of October, 1685, Louis XIV. revoked the former edict granting *liberty of worship* and the privileges above named, leaving the Huguenots *liberty of conscience.*

Let us observe, especially in the present case, that there is a notable difference between these two expressions. *Conscience* is something wholly interior, which necessarily escapes all exterior opposition, while *worship* means something exterior and sensible. When a sect is granted liberty of conscience only, it is not allowed to hold assemblies, or public worship, or to proselyte. Its adherents are simply allowed to live in peace in the country without suffering any inconvenience because of their religious opinion and without being obliged to take part in any other worship. Freedom of worship means more: it permits the public profession and practice of any form of worship, as well as the organization of its clergy, ceremonies, and religious practices.

Was the edict of 1685 lawful? Was it opportune? What must we think of its execution and its results?

A. The lawfulness of the edict of Louis XIV. is easily demonstrated. In fact the Edict of Nantes, even though we regard it as a compact, properly speaking was by no means an irrevocable compact. Even the Protestant Grotius acknowledges this. "The so-called reformers," he says, "should understand that these acts of tolerance are not treaties, but royal edicts issued for the general good, and revocable when the king judges fitting for the same general good." Louis XIV. therefore had a right to revoke the edict of his predecessors.

B. Whether this measure was opportune or not is an historical question which, strictly speaking, does not belong to our subject. But we shall make a few remarks upon it.

When we study attentively the condition of France and the position of the king in 1598, we ask ourselves if Henry IV.

can be blamed for the course he pursued. By means of his second edict he restored peace to the kingdom and re-established order throughout the land. We know, moreover, that it was his intention to withdraw by *degrees* the clauses of the former edict which created a State within a State. Louis XIII., Richelieu, and Louis XIV. (before 1685) carried out the intentions of Henry IV. By skilful and successive measures they gradually reduced the liberty accorded to sectarians, so that in 1685 the complete revocation of the edict was effected without difficulty: the fruit was ripe and naturally fell from the tree.

The revocation was a long-foreseen event, for which the public mind was prepared, hence it excited no serious opposition. Moreover, the conduct of the Huguenots abundantly justified rigorous measures. Revolting against the State after they had revolted against the Church, they were guilty of numerous profanations. They went about destroying crucifixes and images, burning churches and convents, and thus excited against them the nation which was profoundly Catholic. "These outrages, which were the chief features of the Reformation, were also," says M. de Noailles, "one of the chief causes of the aversion which it inspired." Then the danger threatened in Protestant doctrine, the insurrections it excited in Germany, the seditious character which the Huguenot meetings soon assumed, excited the Parliament and authority more and more against them. Moreover, three rebellions in less than ten years, and based upon frivolous pretexts, were more than sufficient to open the eyes of the blindest to the dangerous character of these heretics.

The act of Louis XIV., therefore, was not sudden and unforeseen, but systematically planned and carried out, the state of public opinion helping him not a little to make this decision. "The revocation of the Edict of Nantes," according to Capefigue, "was a patient work, developed with special care and prudence." See his *Histoire de Louis XIV.*,

ch. xxiv., which contains the plan and intentions of the king as he himself wrote them.

C. What are we to think of the execution and the results of that revocation ?

a. In regard to the first point, impartial writers generally agree in censuring some of the measures adopted; they acknowledge nevertheless that the king can be held responsible for them only in as far as he trusted to agents who deviated from his formal intentions. As to the clergy, their share in the revocation consisted in the gentle measures which accompanied its execution.

A truly deplorable effect of the edict of Louis XIV. which ought to be mentioned was the hypocrisy and dissimulation of Protestant families whose assumed Catholicism was purely exterior and compulsory. Their opposition to religion and the State, though silent and passive at first, contributed later in the eighteenth century to the triumph of an infidel philosophy. It was particularly from 1685 that libertines or free-thinkers, conspiring with secret Protestants and Jansenists, began the fierce war which ended in the suppression of the Jesuits and the outbreak of the French Revolution.

b. As to the material results of this revocation, it would be difficult to appreciate them; we have no accurate estimate of the losses occasioned by the withdrawal of a certain number of French subjects who abandoned their country. The figures quoted later are manifestly exaggerated. Moreover, the losses occasioned by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes cannot be compared to the enormous losses in money and human life which the Huguenots cost France.

Here also we would brand the shameless partiality, bad faith, and hypocrisy of a certain class of writers always hostile to the Church. Certainly the governments of Germany, of Switzerland, of Italy, following the example of the sixteenth century, have in our day subjected Catholics to the most cruel treatment. Yet these have never claimed, like the Calvinists, to be a State within a State, nor have

they ever attempted to claim their rights with armed force. On the contrary, they have always given, and still give, an example of most complete submission to the laws. Why, then, are they persecuted? Why are thousands of priests and religious men and women expelled from their country? Why? Simply because they are Roman Catholics. Now, do we find one writer among free-thinkers, these vaunted advocates of liberty, protesting against these outrages? No; they prefer to reserve their denunciations for Louis XIV. and the Inquisition. The motive which inspires them is only too palpable.

ART. V.—CRUSADES AND SO-CALLED RELIGIOUS WARS.

1. We might refrain from treating this question of the Crusades.[1] We have only to read an impartial history to find the justification of these warlike expeditions which exhibit Christian society in all the splendor of religious heroism. Let us observe, however, that the end or motive of the Crusades was perfectly just, and that, so far from having the disastrous effects sometimes attributed to them, they were productive of the happiest results.

A. The Crusades had an end which was just, generous, and civilizing. Mohammed had inspired his followers with the ardor of proselytizing by the sword. Their fanaticism had conquered Spain and, though arrested by the valiant sword of Charles Martel, meditated the conquest of the East and the destruction of civilization. The Emperors of Constantinople appealed to the Christians of the East to protect the last bulwark of Europe, and the Church added her exhortation to this pressing appeal. After Sylvester II. and Sergius IV. had made a generous appeal in behalf of the Christians

[1] *Michaud, History of the Crusades; *Ardier and Kingsford, The Crusades; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 18; Lies, p. 286; Alzog's History of the Church, II., pp. 610, 611; Balmes, ch. 42; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., ch. 7; A. C. Q. Jan. 1903; M. Aug. 1898.

of the Holy Land, St. Gregory VII. wrote to the Emperor in 1074: "The Christians beyond the sea who are suffering unheard-of outrages, and are daily massacred like sheep, have sent to me in their great need, beseeching me to help our brethren by every means in my power in order that the Christian religion may not, God forbid, be completely annihilated in our time."

In answering the appeal made by Urban II. and Peter the Hermit in the Council of Clermont (1095) the Christian princes felt confident they were obeying the will of God. Hitherto they had only defended themselves; now they decided to carry the war into the heart of Islamism, which it was their right and their duty to do, for all the religious and social rights of European nations were threatened by the Mohammedans. Was Europe to await quietly the shame and scourge of slavery; was every Christian nation to allow itself to be oppressed, instead of forming with all the others a holy league against the enemies of the cross? "When we blame these enterprises," says the learned de Guignes in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et des belles-lettres* (t. lxviii.), "it is because we have not sufficiently reflected upon the state of the times. The Mussulmans had taken possession of Syria, and had made themselves masters of Africa, of Spain, and of all the islands of the Mediterranean, whence they continually insulted the inhabitants on the shores of Italy. Through Spain and Corsica they entered and ravaged the southern provinces, and pillaged all the vessels they encountered. Constantinople was a powerful barrier to them; should they succeed in their attempt against it, all Europe would be endangered and run the risk of falling into their power. Attacking them in the centre of their empire would reduce their strength and deal them a blow from which they could never recover."

B. The Crusades, it is true, did not completely accomplish the end for which they were undertaken, but we may say with Count de Maistre, "Though each one failed, yet all succeeded."

To judge these vast enterprises we must take them as a whole, without stopping at the abuses and faults which are the result of human passions, and which are to be found in all wars. Mgr. Pie, in the panegyric on St. Louis, enumerates among the happy results of the Crusades:

1st. The Moslem conquest of Constantinople and the subjugation of the East retarded four hundred years.

2d. The saving of the West and of Christian civilization from the brutalizing rule of Islamism. The Ottoman power, which for centuries threatened to swallow up everything, was so weakened and received such a mortal blow that it continued to exist only through the indulgence of Christianity.

3d. The people of Europe were delivered from the evils which they brought upon themselves by the dissension and incessant wars of prince with prince, lord with lord, city with city. The passion for combats with which the knights were filled found noble vent: ceasing to fight among themselves, Christian warriors united their efforts against the common enemy.

4th. The condition of the people was improved; serfs and vassals were freed by thousands; the commons acquired rights and privileges which curbed the arbitrary and tyrannical power of the lords.

5th. Agriculture, science, and the arts also reaped great advantages. Who does not know that these expeditions paved the way for the beautiful age of Leo X. and Louis XIV.?

6th. They were likewise productive of much spiritual good. "Can the Christian," exclaims Mgr. Pie, "confine his gaze to the present and forget the grand horizon which opens beyond the tomb? Ah! what matters it to me, a man of the next life, what matters it to me that the Crusades are judged wrong according to the cold and tardy computations of our modern calculators, when the holy Abbot of Clairvaux assures me that he learned from Heaven that this employment of the mammon of iniquity secured to thousands of Frenchmen the imperishable treasures of supreme beatitude?

The losses of the terrestrial country were soon forgotten, and the heavenly country was enriched forever. Men of time, you speak to me of numbers; and I, a priest of eternity, I know but one number which interests me and which is worthy of my attention, the eternal number of the elect."

All these advantages largely compensated for the checks which the Crusaders suffered in consequence of dissensions and rivalries among themselves and the perfidy of the Greeks.

2. The name of RELIGIOUS WARS is given specially to the struggles between Catholics and Protestants during the latter half of the sixteenth century. Among the most noted was the first, which began with the massacre of Vassy (1562), and the third, which terminated by the conversion of Henry IV. and the Edict of Nantes. The same name is also applied to the wars of 1625 and 1626, under Louis XIII.; and the war of the Cévennes, or Camisards, under Louis XIV. They have all served as a theme of denunciation for Protestants and unbelievers, yet nothing is easier than to justify the Church in regard to them.

1st. She has never admitted the Mohammedan principle of imposing her doctrine by force. She has been content to protect her rights acquired either over the society which she formed, or the individuals who had sworn allegiance to her.

2d. The wars of religion from the thirteenth century have been the work of heresy and its revolts against the *constituent principles* of society. Heretics, not content with waging a war of words, committed the most barbarous outrages upon the property and persons of individuals; they were enemies of order and civilization, whom rulers were obliged to suppress and chastise by force of arms.

3d. It is to be regretted that in these just and necessary wars carried on by Catholic princes there were at times cruel reprisals, yet they could hardly have been prevented. It would, however, be most unjust to attribute these excesses to the Church, whose spirit is directly opposed to them.

4th. Let us add with Montesquieu: "It is arguing unfairly against religion to enumerate all the evils it has produced (or, rather, of which it has been the occasion or pretext), without considering all the good it has effected; if I were to relate all the evils caused by monarchies, by civil laws, by republican governments, I should relate terrible things."

If these arguments so often used against religion were sound, we should be logically forced to condemn and to destroy all institutions—royalty, civil government, military institutions, and society itself. We cannot read the history of any age without finding a series of crimes which fill us with horror, of dissensions and civil wars which filled the world with bloodshed. Even at the present day, despite our advanced civilization, blood still flows on battle-fields. Would it be logical to conclude that society must be abolished and that it would be preferable for men to betake themselves to the forest and live there like animals? Yet this is the conclusion forced upon us when we close our eyes to the good results of an institution excellent in its nature, to consider only the *abuses of which it may be capable.* Such is not the logic of a reasoning man: in considering the wars occasioned by religion he pities humanity capable of abusing all that is most sacred; but he is far from forgetting the innumerable and eminent benefits this humanity reaps from religion, and the virtue it teaches man to practise.

ART. VI.—THE PAPAL POWER OVER TEMPORAL RULERS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

We know that in the Middle Ages the Pope was universally regarded as the head of the Christian family, and acted

[1] Gosselin; Murphy, l. c., ch. 9–20; Hergenröther, Catholic Church and Christian State, vol. i., Essays 6–12; Manning, Vatican Decrees, ch. 2; Kenrick, Primacy, ch. 15 ff.; Parsons; Studies, II., ch. 15; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essay 8; Wiseman, Essays, vol. v. (on Boniface VIII.); A. C. Q. xiv. 410, xv. 734; D. R. New Ser. xvi. 368; M. lxx. 24. Yorke-Wendtke, Discussion, pt. II.; Br. W. xii., xiii., passim.

accordingly: he summoned sovereigns and their subjects before his tribunals, decided disputes between kings, imposed spiritual penalties upon scandalous and obstinate princes, deprived of their dignities and their rights those who persisted in their disorders.

As there is question of the heads of the Catholic Church, their conduct evidently cannot escape the criticism of the enemies of the Church; let us see what we must think of it.

I. The Power Exercised by the Popes in the Middle Ages over Temporal Princes was Perfectly Lawful.

1. This power was founded on legislation, or the *public law of the time*, that is, upon political constitutions which Christian peoples, their general assemblies, or their rulers, had *freely established*. The Pope was then regarded by princes and peoples as the *natural head* and the *common father* of Christianity. It is not astonishing, then, that they acknowledged his right to decide differences, to bring back the recalcitrant to their duties, and to constrain the perverse and obstinate by excommunicating or deposing them.

2. Most of the monarchies of the Middle Ages were both elective and hereditary; this was notably the case in France, England, and Spain. Usually a member of the reigning family was chosen; but the son himself, to succeed the father, had to be recognized by the national assembly. We can readily understand that these assemblies imposed on the sovereign elected conditions to which he pledged himself. One condition was fidelity to the Catholic faith, and it was stipulated that if the prince deviated from it or persecuted it, *he lost his power*.

3. Many princes, moreover, rendered homage for their crown to the see of Peter, voluntarily placing in subjection to it their States in the character of fiefs, and acknowledging themselves its vassals.[1] Of this number were John Lack-

[1] Hergenröther, l. c., vol. ii., Essay 10.

land, King of England (1213), Robert Guiscard of Naples (1053), Roger II. of Sicily (1130), Peter II. of Aragon. St. Stephen, King of Hungary, had also in the year 1000 offered homage for his kingdom, and Godfrey of Bouillon for the kingdom of Jerusalem. In virtue of these acts the Pope had over all these States the ordinary rights of a suzerain, or paramount lord, over his vassals. We know that feudal right conferred upon the suzerain the right to punish the felony of a vassal who failed in any of his obligations: he could take his fief from him or give the investiture of it to another. The formula of the oaths taken by the vassals of the Holy See, moreover, attest the existence of this right in the sovereign Pontiff. Let us remark, in passing, that the Pope never used this right by taking to himself either the whole or a part of the States of a vassal guilty of felony.

Remarks.—1st. To judge the Middle Ages by the ideas which prevailed after the Protestant Reformation, and particularly after the peace of Westphalia, when equal rights were granted to the various Christian communities, would be to commit a deplorable and absurd anachronism. "All Christians," says the learned Cardinal Hergenröther in his "Catholic Church and Christian State," "formed in the Middle Ages but one family. The head, the father, required for this family was supplied by him whom all nations honored as common father, the vicar of God, the successor of St. Peter, the representative of Jesus Christ, to whom was confided the power to feed the lambs and the sheep." "By entering the Church," writes Canon Moulart, professor in the University of Louvain; "by taking Christianity as the religion of the State itself; by recognizing in the end of religion the supreme and sole end of all society composed of mankind; by making, as a natural consequence of these premises, their laws in harmony with supernatural dogmas and morals, the nations of Europe attained a veritable union based upon a complete uniformity of ideas, interests, tendencies, and legislation;

and they thus formed Christendom." In this author's beautiful work the question of the indirect temporal power of the Pope is very fully treated (*L'Eglise et l'Etat*).

The ceremonies which took place at the consecration of the Emperor of the West show us the ideas of the time. The Pope warned the Emperor that he received his power in order to govern his subjects and to *protect the true Church of God.* To these words the Emperor replied with the following oath: "I, King of the Romans, by the grace of God future emperor, do promise and swear before God and St. Peter to be henceforth the protector and defender of the sovereign Pontiff of the Holy Roman Church in all its necessities and needs; I will guard and protect all its possessions, respect its rights to the best of my power and knowledge, with the assistance of God, in good and pure faith. So help me God and the holy Gospels."

The tenor of this oath perfectly explains the language of the vassals of Henry IV. at the time of his quarrel with Gregory VII. or Hildebrand. They wrote the Emperor that they had sworn allegiance to him, but on condition that he should be king for the *edification and not for the destruction of the Church of God;* on condition that he should govern according to the laws of justice respecting the property and the rights of all. They added that since he had been the first to violate the compact, they were released from their oath of allegiance. These words of the lords clearly manifest the opinion of contemporaries in regard to the constitution of the empire.

2d. It may be asked if, as a number of authors say, the power of the Popes in the Middle Ages had not still *another foundation* than that which we have just indicated, whether it was not also in virtue of the divine right *proper to them* that the sovereign Pontiff frequently interfered in affairs of State? This is a question concerning which there is much controversy and upon which theologians differ. We cannot give to the examination of this question, much less important

moreover, the developments it requires. Let us be satisfied with saying a few words on the subject. According to the teaching of theology, the Pope, who has received from God a *direct* power over *spiritual* things, they being his proper domain, has received at the same time an *indirect* power over temporal things, that is, as far as is necessary to the Church, in order that she *may fulfil her mission*. But there is a great variety of opinion as to what this indirect power consists of. No doubt all theologians recognize the *directive* power of the Pope: that it belongs to him to interpret authentically the natural law and the divine law; to enlighten and direct by his doctrinal decisions the consciences of princes and Christian nations; to judge the morality of their acts, and to inflict ecclesiastical penalties upon the guilty. But as to whether he may go further—for example, depose monarchs or rulers, release subjects from their oath of allegiance—opinions are divided, and the Church has given no decision.[1] Bellarmin, for example, sustains that he can. Others, like Bianchi and Gousset, say that the sovereign Pontiff does not himself depose a ruler who is obstinate in ill doing, he confines himself to *declaring* that the abuse of power has been such that it entails *ipso facto, of itself*, the loss of this power. There is, they say, a pledge, at least an implicit pledge, of fidelity between the king and his subjects, and this pledge is dissolved when it becomes impossible for the subjects to preserve the faith unless the prince is deposed; for the obligation to preserve the faith is, they add, a divine law, while that of obeying this or that sovereign is a human law, which must yield to the divine.

Conclusion.—But whatever view we take of these controverted questions, one thing remains certain, viz., that at this time, when unity of faith was complete, and Church and State were intimately united, there existed a *veritable agreement* by which the ruler pledged himself to govern

[1] Manning, Newman, and others against Gladstone; Br. W. vi. 514, vii. 554, x. 398, xi. often.

with justice, to defend the faith, to suppress heresy, and not to incur excommunication himself. This was incontestably the *public law* of that period, and these are facts which must be borne in mind when we consider this question. Was a ruler false to his pledge? It belonged to the *Head of Christianity* to decide whether he merited excommunication, and eventually whether it was time to declare the subjects *released* from their oath of obedience to the unfaithful mandatary who, by his own infidelity, had forfeited his former rights. This affords a perfect explanation of the conduct of St. Gregory VII. toward the Emperor of Germany,[1] Henry IV.; that of Innocent III. toward John Lackland; of Innocent IV. toward Frederick II.; of Boniface VIII. toward Philip le Bel.

II. The Popes Exercised their Rights in a Manner Very Salutary to Society.[2]

1. History attests that the Popes during the Middle Ages rendered inestimable service on the one hand by preventing princes from failing in their duties, and on the other by keeping the people in just submission. The people were protected by them against the tyranny of rulers, and rulers against the revolt of their subjects. See the history of John Lackland, of the Emperor Henry IV., of Frederick I., of Frederick II.[3] The Popes were the true safeguards of the legitimate franchises of peoples. Protestant writers—Voigt,

[1] Life of Gregory VII. by Villemain.

[2] Gosselin, p. II., ch. 4; Murphy, ch. 40; Brann; A. C. Q. iv. 222; D. R., April 1894, p. 278.

[3] In 1861 M. Guizot wrote in *L'Eglise et la Société:* "All things considered, the Papacy, and only the Papacy, could be the powerful mediator by defending, in the name of religion, the natural rights of man against States, princes, and the various nations themselves; it was the Papacy which reconciled the weak with the strong by always inculcating in all things justice, peace, and respect for duties and engagements; in this way it laid the foundation-stone of international right by rising against the claims and passions of brute force."

in his history of Gregory VII., and Hurter, in that of Innocent III.—prove with evidence that these Popes saved civilization by their energetic resistance to the corruption of the age and the ambitious and despotic aims of emperors like Henry IV. and Frederick II.

2. The sentence of the sovereign Pontiff frequently decided quarrels between princes. At the present day congresses have taken the place of the sovereign Pontiff, but this system does not offer the same guarantee of impartiality and light; thus it did not prevent the partition of Poland, the abolition of the ecclesiastical principalities after the French Revolution, the persecutions in Switzerland and elsewhere.

REMARK.—The result of impartial study of this subject has been to make the Papacy of the Middle Ages so highly appreciated that Urquhart,[1] a distinguished Protestant writer, did not hesitate recently to ask that the present system of deciding international questions by a congress be abandoned and recourse be had to the supreme arbitration of the Pope. At the end of the seventeenth century Leibnitz said: "In my opinion Europe and the civilized world ought to institute at Rome a tribunal of arbitration presided over by the Pope, which should take cognizance of the differences between Christian princes. This tribunal established over princes to direct and judge them would bring us back to the golden age." The celebrated English minister, Pitt, was of the same opinion. "We must," he wrote in 1794, "find a new bond to unite us all. The Pope alone can form this bond. Only Rome can make her impartial and unprejudiced voice heard; for no one doubts for an instant the integrity of her judgment." Finally, let us hear Voltaire himself: "The interest of the human race requires that there be a curb which will restrain sovereigns and protect the life of nations: this curb of religion might by universal consent have been placed in the hands of the Popes."

[1] An Appeal to the Pope. See O'Reilly, Life of Leo XIII., ch. 33.

ART. VII.—THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPES.

This discussion concerning the power exercised in the Middle Ages by the Popes over temporal princes leads us to say a few words upon a very different question, but one of great importance at the present time, the temporal power of the Pope.[1]

"It was by a special providence of God that this authority (the Church) was furnished with a civil principality as the best safeguard of her independence" (Leo XIII., Encycl. on Christian States). "God," says St. Anselm, "loves nothing so much as the freedom of His Church."

History witnesses to the perfect lawfulness of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. It was brought about so naturally by circumstances that, as J. De Maistre says, "the Popes became sovereigns without knowing it, and even in spite of themselves." In the fourth and particularly in the sixth century the Church of Rome possessed vast territories in several countries of Europe and in Africa. By law the imperial sovereignty still existed, but in fact it had long been supplanted by the paternal dominion of the Roman pontiffs. We know how the invasion of the barbarians, and the abandonment in which unhappy Italy was left

[1] Dupanloup; Manning; Ming; Maglione; Schroeder; Chatard, Essays 5, 15, 17; Gibbons, Faith of O. F., ch. 12; Parsons, Studies, I., p. 501; Abp. Hughes' Works, vol. ii.; Murphy, ch. 9; A. C. Q. xvii. 72, xxv. 776; C. W. xxv. 609, xxxv. 1, lii. 340, lv. 425, Dec. 1900, Feb. 1902; M. S. H., June 1901, June 1902; M. lxvii. 305; I. E. R., May 1893, Sept. 1896; Best, Victories of Rome; Lacordaire, conf. 4 on the Church. On *Rome* under the Popes see Miley; Maguire; C. W. xxviii. 101.

The reader ought to remember that the term "the temporal power of the Pope" is variously used by Catholic writers. Some, like our author, use it to indicate the princely or sovereign power which the Pope formerly exercised as civil ruler over the so-called papal states. With others it means the power wielded by the Popes of the Middle Ages over Christian nations and rulers in civil and temporal affairs, as explained in the preceding article.—EDITOR.

by the emperors of Byzantium, forced the populations to seek the efficacious protection of the papacy, which several times had saved them from the most imminent peril and caused order and justice to reign among them. The temporal supremacy of the Popes, tacitly acknowledged by the emperors of Constantinople, was singularly affirmed by the solemn act of Pepin le Bref, in which he pledged himself to have restored to the Holy See all the cities and territories occupied by the Lombards. This promise was not only executed, but new lands were added by him to the *restored* provinces; and this liberality was sanctioned in 754 by an act of perpetual cession and abandonment to the Holy See, signed by the King of the Lombards. Then followed the rich donations of Charlemagne, and later those of Countess Mathilda. The great emperor, as well as the French lords, solemnly promised to preserve to the Holy See the States which had been solemnly restored to it.

We see that de Maistre had reason to say, "There is nothing so evidently just in its origin as this Pontifical Sovereignty. Hence it has been fearlessly said: If the possessions of the head of the Church are questioned, let the reigning families of the present day prepare to descend from the throne." "The temporal kingdom," says the Protestant Gibbon, "is founded upon a thousand years of respect, and the Popes' noblest claim to temporal sovereignty is the free choice of a people delivered by them from servitude."

We do not need to refute here the futile objections of those who seek to prove that the spiritual power of the Pope is incompatible with temporal power. We have the history of the Papacy itself to prove that temporal independence is, in the designs of Providence, a guarantee of the spiritual independence necessary to the head of the universal Church.[1]

[1] "The Bishop of Rome was not made Pope by acquiring the temporal principality; but that principality was acquired by him, or conferred on him, because he was already Pope, that he might be independent in his spiritual government of the universal Church." Br. W., xii., p. 456 f.

"For the Pope," said Thiers in a celebrated discourse, "there is no spiritual independence without temporal independence, without sovereignty." The truth of this is sufficiently demonstrated by what takes place in Russia and Constantinople. Napoleon himself recognized how important it is for the sovereign Pontiff to be, as Bossuet says, "in a state to exercise more freely for the general good and under the protection of Christian rulers the heavenly power of governing souls." Here are his words as reported by the historian of *Du Consulat et de l'Empire:* "The Pope is far from Paris, and it is well he is; he is neither at Madrid nor at Vienna, and for this reason we accept his spiritual authority. At Vienna and at Madrid the same must be said. Do you think that if he were at Paris the Austrians and Spaniards would receive his decisions? It is most fortunate, therefore, that he does not live among us, and that living removed from us he does not live among our rivals, but dwells in that old Rome far from the influence of the German emperors, far from the rulers of France and the kings of Spain, holding the balance between the Catholic sovereigns, inclined always a little toward the stronger, but protesting promptly if the stronger becomes the oppressor. Centuries have brought this about, and they have done well. For the government of souls it is the best, the most beneficent institution that can be imagined. I am not led to say this through any spirit of devotion, but by reason."

We might add other proofs in favor of pontifical royalty, notably its happy effect upon the interior administration of the Church; but contemporary events set forth with still greater prominence the advantages of this providential institution. Moreover, the unanimity with which the enemies of the Church have applauded the sacrilegious outrages which we have had the misfortune to witness, their eagerness to prevent the restoration of the temporal power, make evident to all faithful children of the Church the lawfulness and the opportuneness of the claims of the Holy

See and of the Catholic world. We unceasingly demand the restoration of the temporal power of the Holy See in order that the spiritual supremacy of the Popes may be exercised freely and efficaciously.[1]

ART. VIII.—BAD POPES.

One of the charges made against the holiness of the Church is: the Church has not always been a school of morality, since its very heads have disgraced the pontifical chair.

After what we have said above, pp. 321 ff., the answer to this question presents no difficulty.

The Church labors unceasingly for the sanctification of her children: this is her mission. But the grace offered to man to enlighten his intelligence and strengthen his will in no way constrains him. He may refuse this grace and make his conduct contradict his belief, but he does so only by stifling his conscience, by trampling under foot a religion which unceasingly calls him to his duty, exhorts him to the practice of virtue, and threatens him with most terrible punishments if he persists in his evil-doing. Hence there have always been sinners in the bosom of the Church; side by side with great virtues we find vice and disorders, the effects of the weakness and malice of man's heart.

The Popes themselves, notwithstanding their high calling and their grave obligations, are men: if they are infallible in their doctrinal teaching, they are not impeccable. They may

[1] "I will not, of course, condone the spoliation of the Papacy. That spoliation remains a crime against international law, and a blot on the history of Italy. I will not desist from proclaiming that the fitting position of the Papacy amid the nations of Christendom is one of plenary independence." Archbp. Ireland, Church and Modern Society.

[2] Murphy, ch. 37; Bp. England's Works, vol. ii., p. 436 ff.; D. R. Old Ser. xxxviii. 1; C. W. xliv. 215, 365; Burnet, Path, ch. 9; Spalding, Evid., lect. 7, n. 9.

fall, as St. Peter himself fell, but their sin is the act of the man and not of the Pontiff; these stains, wholly personal, in no way mar the holiness or the authority of the Holy See.[1] This is a case for the application of Our Saviour's words: Do what they tell you and not what they do. (Matth. xxiii. 3).

Remarks.—1st. History shows us from St. Peter to Leo XIII. 259 Popes, all of whom, with very few exceptions, were irreproachable, and a great number of whom were men eminent for their knowledge, their wisdom, and their virtues. Is not this a spectacle as worthy of admiration as of respect? Where shall we find in the civil order a dynasty comparable to this series of the heads of the Church of Rome?

2d. They cite, it is true, a few Popes who seem to have been an exception, particularly Stephen VI. and John XII. in the tenth century, Benedict IX. in the eleventh, and Alexander VI. at the end of the fifteenth century. But, first of all, this number is very small; it is hardly perceptible in the multitude of the others. Would it be just to protest unceasingly against magistracy because a few magistrates failed in their duty, or against printing because there are writers who abuse the invention?

3d. Moreover, it is proved that many of the facts alleged against the Popes have been, if not malicious inventions, greatly exaggerated or falsely represented. Witness the absurd tale of the female Pope Joan, who, it was alleged, occupied the chair of Peter under the name of John VIII., after the death of Leo IV., in 855. This fable, which was current for a long time, is now recognized as one of the most

[1] "I maintain that if the ancestry of Judah's royal line, magnificent as it was and destined to be the forerunner of Him of whom St. Paul had many and great things to declare, could yet include some of the worst sinners, why might not the apostolical succession, in which was, individually or collectively, naught so holy as He to whom all the prophets bore witness, in whom was seen on earth all the glory of the Father, full of grace and truth?" Purcell's Debate with Campbell, p. 157. See also the excellent remarks ib. p. 156.

flagrant historical lies by Protestants themselves, and by unbelievers, such as Dumoulin, Bayle, and Basnage.[1] The memory of more than one Pope unjustly defamed by writers hostile to the Church has been completely restored, and, what is more, by Protestant historians. This was the case, for example, in regard to Gregory VII. and Innocent III.[2]

4th. We must further observe that no Pope, whatever his private life, ever issued a decree contrary to the purity of faith and morals; nor has one ever taught or instituted anything for the purpose of legitimizing his disorders. Certainly we cannot say as much for the heads of Protestantism. They desired nothing so much as to abolish celibacy and monastic vows. In the facts which we have stated above we recognize a striking proof of the assistance which God unceasingly grants His Church.[3]

[1] Doellinger, Fables; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 2; C. W. ix. 1.

[2] Dr. O. Brownson, replying in C. W., April '69, to an attack on the Popes by *Harper's Magazine*, states that he has studied the history of the Roman Pontiffs with great care and diligence, both as an antipapist and as a papist, with an earnest desire to find facts against the Popes and with an equally earnest desire to ascertain the exact historical truth. As a result of his investigations he lays down the rule "that everything that reflects injuriously on the character of a Bishop of Rome is *presumptively* false, and to be accepted only on the most indubitable evidence." Br. W., xiii., p. 147.

[3] "Nothing gives me more faith in the genuineness and truth of our holy religion than when, in reviewing the history of these disgraceful enormities, I find the Church, in the very midst of scandal enough to blacken and overthrow any earthly institution, still supported and upheld by the almighty hand of God; a Church that has stood through all that the gentleman has laid to the charge of the merely mortal men who have presided for a season over its destinies. A few of them have erred in morals, but none of them in faith; sound doctrine and sound morals were seen and admired, during these sad eclipses, and infidel nations were, during that passing obscurity in Rome, rejoicing in the beams of the orient Sun of justice heralded by Catholic missionaries." Purcell's Debate, p. 145.

In regard to special charges against certain Popes we may consult ecclesiastical histories or special works, such as those by Pastor and Mann.

EDITOR'S NOTE.

THE author takes up in the present chapter certain accusations against the Church taken from her history. But in a countless variety of forms she is also charged with "false, immoral, and blasphemous" doctrines and practices, charges to which the Catholic apologist must give a solid reply. This, however, would demand another volume. Hence it must suffice here to tell the reader where he may find comparatively full answers to those vain accusations.

Much will be found in the books mentioned in the preface, p. 9. But Dr. Ryder's "Catholic Controversy" is undoubtedly the best popular manual of this kind. Bishop England (his works, vols. i., ii., iii.), Card. Gibbons (Faith of Our Fathers), Gother (The Papist Misrepresented), Searle (Plain Facts), Conway (The Question Box), and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary take up most of the subjects mentioned under the following four heads:

1. The *Doctrines* of Confession (Hunter, III.; Melia; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., II., n. 24; C. T. S. xxxiv.), Indulgences (ib., also Bp. Hedley, O. S. B.); Probabilism and Casuistry (M. xliii. 185, Dec. 1901; Rickaby, essay 3), Lying and Equivocation (U. B. Jan. '95; Rickaby, essay 4; Jones, S.J., Dishonest Criticism), Tyrannicide (A. C. Q. xxvii.; Hergenroether, C. Ch., II., p. 263 ff.; Gerard, Antidote), Intention in the administration of sacraments (Bp. England, I., p. 474 ff.; C. T. S. xxiv.; Hunter, III., n. 683; Dodsworth, Popular Delusions and Objections, etc., p. 54). See also Newman, Development, p. 381 ff.

2. The practice of *Simony* in giving money for Masses and sacraments (Ryder, p. 239; Searle, p. 221), for indulgences (Green; Bp. England, III., p. 13 ff.), for dispensation from Fasting (e. g. Balla cruciata, Bp. England, III., p. 191 ff.) and marriage impediments, for ecclesiastical appointments and promotion to clerical orders (C. W. xxxiii. 245, xxxv. 738). See also Gerard; Dodsworth; C. T. S. vii., xi.

3. The practice of *Superstition* and even *Idolatry* in worshipping the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Manning, Miscell., II., p. 1; Hunter, II., n. 536; Dalgairns, Devotion to the S. H., Introd.; C. W. May 1901), the Bl. Virgin Mary, the Saints and Angels, holy relics and images (Br. W. viii. 117 ff.; Bp. England, II., p. 96 ff.; C. T. S. xviii. xxx.; A. E. R. Oct. 1902); in using blessed articles, e. g. scapulars, medals, beads, and the crucifix; in offering prayers for the Dead (Bp. England, I., 265 ff.). See also Br. W. vi. 337 ff., 380 ff.; Newman, l. c., 398 ff.; Hunter, III., n. 842; De Trevern; Bagshawe, Threshold; Ségur, Short and Familiar Answers; C. T. S. iv., v., xiv.; M. June 1898, May 1902; Garside.

4. Useless and injurious *Observances*, e. g. Celibacy (C. T. S. xli.; J. C., Why Should Priests Wed?; M. May 1898), Religious Vows and life in Convents (Br. W. viii. 219; St. Thomas, Apology for Religious Orders; Feasey; C. W. March 1901; M. Dec. 1899; D. R., Old Ser. xxx. 467; C. T. S. xix., xlvii.), Communion in one kind (Garside, p. 125), Fasting (Butler, Feasts and Fasts, Tr. 5; Gaume, Catech., IV. p. 319 ff.); External Ceremonial (Tyrrell; Bridgett; Bagshawe, Credentials, p. 258; Chatard, Truths, n. 8; Burke, Reasonableness of Catholic Ceremonies; C. W. June, 1901), Latin language in public service (C. T. S. ix.; Bp. England, II., p. 50 ff.).

5. On Scandals and *Abuses* in the Church see Allnatt, The Church and the Sects, l. 1; Searle; Dodsworth; Ricards, C. Ch., p. 94 f.; Spalding, J. M., History of Reform., I., ch. 3.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH AND CIVILIZATION.[1]

"The Church, the immortal work of a merciful God, although by its nature," says the Holy Father, "it aims primarily at the salvation of souls and the eternal happiness of heaven, confers, nevertheless, in the temporal order so many and such great benefits that it could not produce more or greater if it had been specially and chiefly instituted to procure the prosperity of this present life" (Encycl. on Christian States).

This chapter will be a commentary upon these words of Leo XIII. We shall show what the Church has done for civilization and the temporal happiness of nations; but we cannot give to this beautiful and vast subject the development it requires, for that would need a volume. We shall endeavor, however, to say sufficient to enable us to recognize in the benefits which the Church has conferred upon the world a *new mark of her divine origin:* the tree is known by its fruits.

The object of civilization is the development, the perfection, the welfare of the *whole man* in all that relates to this

[1] Leo XIII., The Church and Civilization (O'Shea, N. Y.); Allies, I., II.; Balmes; Manahan; Montalembert; Ozanam; Thébaud, Ch. and M. W.; Moriarty; Murphy, pt. iv.; Hettinger, Rev. Rel., ch. 7; Schanz, III., ch. 15; Gibbons, Ch. Herit.; Kenrick, Primacy, ch. 23; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essays 7 and 46; Archbp. Hughes, I.; Lacordaire, conf. 32 ff. on Cath. Doctr.; Br. W. ix., xii., xiv.; A. C. Q. x. 193; D. R. Old Ser. xxxiv. (trade, manufacture), xlviii. 81, 422, New Ser. vi. 297, xxi. 323, and xxii. 69 (usury laws); C. W. i. 775, iii. 638, lviii. 1, xiii. 342 (legislation), xxviii. 459 (labor), xxix. 192 (medicine).

present life. Man appears to us in the natural order in three distinct though inseparable states: we may consider him as an individual, as member of a family, as member of a public society. If his happiness is to be complete, the lawful needs of his *soul* and *body* must be satisfied; and in his *family* as well as in *civil society* he must find order, peace, joy, all that can lawfully conduce to the happiness of life. In other words, the welfare and progress must extend to the whole man and include in a just proportion and perfect balance his material, intellectual, and moral interest; this progress and these advantages must also extend to society taken collectively, as well as to its individual members. We have remarked, it is true, that the proper and immediate mission of the Church is not to civilize nations and distribute to them the benefits of this present life; she has a higher end: to sanctify man, to reform him in his moral and religious life, and thus to lead him to the eternal happiness of heaven. But it is very evident that in helping man to govern his passions, in reforming and perfecting souls, in setting before them the reason for suffering and death, in teaching them, with the prospect of heaven, to bear the trials of life with patience, Christianity has borne its fruits from the very beginning: it has contributed powerfully to the relative welfare of mankind upon earth. By elevating and ennobling the individuals who compose society it necessarily exercised a civilizing influence upon society itself. "How admirable is the Christian religion," says Montesquieu, "which, though it seems to have no other object than the happiness of the other life, yet makes our happiness in this." It is easy to convince ourselves of the truth of those words, which are, moreover, only a philosophic and social commentary of the profound words of St. Paul: "Godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." We may give a still higher definition of civilization and say with M. Kurth that "social perfection, or in other words civilization, con-

sists in that form of society which affords its members the greatest facilities for attaining their final end." In fact, in the designs of God, everything here below, and society itself, is given to man to help him to attain this supreme end of his existence, his eternal salvation. Hence no trace of true civilization is to be found in pagan times. But as one of the ends of this chapter is to answer the charges made against the Church in the name of civilization, understood in the ordinary sense, we shall assume our adversary's views in order to refute them.

ART. I.—THE STATE OF THE WORLD BEFORE CHRIST, OR PAGAN CIVILIZATION.[1]

I. A General Glance.

At the present day, when the Gospel has completely changed and regenerated the world, we are apt to forget the benefits we have received from it, or to enjoy them with proud ingratitude. We speak with complacency of fraternity, equality, philanthropy, of charity itself, but we are prone to forget that the world is indebted to Jesus Christ and to His Church for these noble sentiments and civilizing virtues.

Certainly we are far from denying the material civilization of the Roman world at the birth of the Church. We acknowledge, on the contrary, that in this respect it had attained an extraordinary degree of splendor. Our own times, despite all our inventions and discoveries, can hardly be compared to the old world. Count de Champagny gives a striking picture in *Les Césars* of this extraordinary prosperity of Rome. Nor can we deny the high rank which pagan Rome already held in the world of letters. No one would venture to deny the writers of the age of Augustus and Pericles the

[1] Thébaud, Gentilism; Marcy; Allies, vol. i., ii., iii.; Alzog, Ch. Hist., I., hist. introd.; Manahan, bk. i.; A. C. Q. v. 468.

superior merit of *form*. Their style is enchanting, and the art of the writer is carried to the highest degree. Yet under this brilliant exterior and attractive form we find absolute poverty of doctrine and lack of reality. In regard, particularly, to religious truths, the most fundamental and the most necessary to man in this world and in the next, nothing but doubt, uncertainty, contradictions, and monstrous errors prevail.

But do this material grandeur and this intellectual superiority constitute true civilization, or have they ever made a people happy? Evidently not, for the true happiness of individuals as well as of peoples cannot consist in such enjoyments. Man was created to know, to love, and to serve God in this world, and to possess Him eternally in the next. His mind and his heart are made for the True and the Good, that is, for God Himself. In vain does man turn from his last end, in vain does he despise or ignore it; it nevertheless remains his end, and the words of St. Augustine will never cease to be true: "Thou hast made us, O Lord, for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it finds rest in Thee." Moreover, experience tells us plainly enough that the capacity of the human heart is infinite, so to speak; that its desires are immense, and only immensity can fill it. Now, neither in extent nor duration can immensity be found in creatures. What do all creatures avail to satisfy the human heart's hunger for happiness? They are hardly more than a drop in the ocean.

And then, to speak only of ancient times and the very centres of pagan civilization, it is well known that only a limited class enjoyed the privileges of this temporal prosperity. Cicero tells us that in populous Rome there were hardly two thousand landowners. In the reign of Nero six great landholders possessed half the Roman province of Africa, that is, a territory much larger than all England. The masses were miserable and knew the pleasures of their masters only to envy them. Pauperism was a deep and

hideous wound. The moral picture of the world before Christianity given us by writers of antiquity is most sad and appalling. We have no difficulty in acknowledging that noble thoughts, generous sentiments, kind and beneficent deeds are to be found in pagan antiquity, for the image of God in man, though horribly disfigured, has never been completely effaced. But it is no less certain that the salient trait of all, the universal and dominant character of the world before Christ, was pitiless hardness combined with gross immorality of institutions and customs. Reality on this point exceeds anything that can be imagined, and there is nothing in the corruption of the present day that can be compared to it. The gentlest among men and the most polished nations exhibited a hardness of heart, a contempt for humanity, a hatred of the poor, a horror of the unfortunate, a thirst for blood, murder, and infamy of all kinds, that we, with our centuries of Christian training, can hardly conceive of. The whole world was given up to a boundless pride, an unrestrained selfishness, a cruel sensuality which remorselessly sacrificed everything to its desires.

Let us hear how St. Paul sums up the history of the whole ancient world. Addressing the Romans, whose triumphant civilization had absorbed all the strength and all the vices of the conquered peoples, he tells them to their face with that intrepid firmness which fears no contradiction: You are without affection, without fidelity; you are filled with malice, with iniquity, with bitterness; hateful, hating one another; finally, you are without mercy (Rom. i. and iii.; Tit. iii.). And yet St. Paul is the most reserved of all the writers of that time. Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Plautus, Titus, Livy, Tacitus, Juvenal, Suetonius, Plutarch, Seneca, relate the horrors of pagan society with a good faith and indifference which make one shudder. It is evident this was the accepted and public morality of the most civilized nations. Strangers, prisoners, the vanquished, slaves, debtors, the sick, the poor, the aged, children, women, all who were weak,

all who suffered, all who labored—in a word, the great majority of the human race was hated, despised, and oppressed. The rest wallowed in the mire of vice. Vice itself was deified; it had its temples, its priests, its altars in every city of the world; disorder became a social obligation, and immorality a public worship. (See above, p. 237 ff.)

Such was the pagan world before the coming of Christ. Now to this world without pity, without love, without compassion, without virtue, plunged in every kind of error and iniquity, succeeded the world we know, radiant with the light of truth, of purity, of charity. What wrought this wonderful transformation, so impossible to foresee? What do we find at the point where these two worlds so widely different meet? We find a cross, and on that cross Jesus Christ, the Founder of Christianity, dying to redeem and regenerate fallen and degraded humanity.

Do we need anything further to recognize the divinity of Jesus Christ and His work, the Catholic Church?

But this general outline will hardly suffice to make us appreciate the extent of the benefits we owe to Christ and to the Church our Mother. We must enter somewhat more into detail lest it be imagined that we have painted in exaggerated colors the brief picture which we have given of the corruption and depravity of the pagan world. It is understood, of course, that there are certain revolting details which we shall be obliged to pass over in silence.

II. The Lot of Individuals.

We shall speak especially of slaves, gladiators, the poor, the working classes, that is, of the great majority of mankind.

I. SLAVES.[1]

1. Number of Slaves.—Mr. Duruy, formerly Minister of Education in France, addressing the working men one day, justly observed that if they had lived in ancient times

[1] See references below, p. 536.

probably not one among them would have been a free man; they all would have groaned in the horrors of slavery. In fact the historical number of these unfortunate creatures is marvellous. In Attica alone the official census made by Demetrius Phalereus gives the number of free citizens as 20,000, and the slaves as 40,000. At Rome one Roman owned 1,000, another 10,000, another 20,000. According to Chateaubriand and Mgr. De Salinis six million men who were called the king's people oppressed, persecuted, and trampled under foot one hundred and twenty million slaves. In brief, the number of the slaves was so great that the senate, Seneca tells us, would never permit them to wear a special dress lest they should realize their numbers. "There was great alarm," he says, "at the small number of free men." It is to be noted, moreover, that slavery existed everywhere, among the most civilized as well as the most barbarous nations; hence we may say that at the coming of Christ the greater number of mankind were slaves.

2. How Slaves were Regarded.—The unanimous teaching of antiquity was that slavery was founded upon natural law, that is, that among men some are born to be free, others to be slaves. "Nature," says Aristotle, "requires that there be slaves." Varron enumerates them among the implements of labor. "There is, however, a difference," he says, "oxen bellow, slaves speak, and the plough is silent." "A wise husbandman," says Cato, the censor, "must get rid of all implements no longer in use, worn-out ploughs, old horses, aged slaves." Hence when sickness or old age rendered them useless they were put to death or left to die of hunger. Nor did the law take slaves under its protection. On the contrary, it confirmed these barbarous doctrines. In the eyes of the law a slave was not the servant but the property of the master; he was not a man, but a chattel. "He was null, rather than vile—*non tam vilis quam nullus;* there was no rest for him—*non est otium servis;* he counted as nothing—*pro nullis adhibentur;* a slave has no right—

servus nullum caput habet; he was as one dead—*servitus mortis assimilatur.*"

3. TREATMENT OF SLAVES.—If such were the opinions current among even good men, if such were the laws, we can readily imagine the fate of the unfortunate creatures condemned by birth, by the fortunes of war, by debt to servitude. It fills one with horror to read the details on this subject given by Fr. de Champagny in *Les Césars*. Yet he only repeats what is related by all the writers of antiquity without the least protest or sign of disapproval.

The Roman law recognized no right in a slave—*servus nullum jus habet;* hence his master could treat him like a domestic animal, overwhelm him with blows, torture him, and even put him to death without being held responsible by any one; there was no obligation towards a slave—*in personam servilem nulla cadit obligatio.* The law required that when a master was killed by one of his slaves, all the others, whatever their number, dwelling under the same roof should be crucified. It is needless to say that the pagan masters, usually as selfish and cruel as they were vicious, amply availed themselves of their absolute right over their slaves, and exceeded, if possible, the ferocity of the laws by their barbarous application of them. The lot of these unfortunate creatures was frequently so terrible that they sometimes flung themselves in despair into the arena to be devoured by wild beasts. To lessen the expense of the animals kept for the circus Caligula ordered them to be fed with slaves.

II. GLADIATORS.

In addition to slavery, there was something still more horrible, before Christianity: the games of the circus and the combats of the gladiators. The spectacle of men killing one another or devoured by wild beasts was the great amusement, the supreme pleasure, of the Roman people. The day being all too short for such pleasures, the slaughters

were prolonged into the night by the light of torches. All that the populace asked of their base and tyrannical masters in exchange for their liberty was bread and amusement—*panem et circenses*.

It was this thirst for human blood which built the vast enclosures the ruins of which we still admire, and organized the great hunting expeditions in remote provinces for the purpose of capturing alive the wild animals which were baited with human victims. The nobles vied with one another in the production of wild beasts for the slaughtering of fellow creatures in the arena.

The human combats were still more horrible; for example, to cite a single instance, at the celebration of the triumph of Titus, who was called the delight of mankind, thousands of men were forced to fight to the death during one hundred days; and this wise emperor himself delivered over to the circus at the time of his father's obsequies five thousand gladiators. The good Trajan to celebrate his triumph over the Dacians gave to the games, which lasted one hundred and twenty-three days, ten thousand gladiators and eleven thousand wild beasts.

In the mock sea-fights for which immense reservoirs were constructed, millions of victims perished by drowning. "It is estimated," says Loudun in his work *L'Antiquité*, "that the spectacle of the gladiators cost, on an average, thirty thousand men a year." In fact there were months in which more than twenty thousand men slaughtered one another for the amusement of the people.

And these hideous spectacles, which were at first confined to the Romans, spread throughout the whole empire, into Gaul, Greece, and Asia, and were, moreover, sanctioned by the law and approved by the sages of the time; no pagan was ever moved to pity by the fate of these unfortunate creatures; the victims themselves, forgetting that they had a right to live, died saluting the god Cæsar. As for Cicero, Pliny, and all the fine minds of the time, they saw in

these cruel games only a noble institution, and an excellent discipline to fortify the people against suffering. Pliny goes so far in his panegyric as to praise Trajan for not giving the spectators to the games. But humane instincts did not always prevail to this extent; on one occasion, when there were no gladiators for the beasts, Caligula, Tacitus tells us, ordered that the first-comers among the spectators be thrown into the arena, taking the precaution to have their tongues cut out in order to stifle their cries. To satisfy the thirst of the patricians for human blood, the senate, the same historian says, decreed that the gladiators should no longer fight in couples, but in masses as in a regular battle.

III. THE POOR AND THE UNFORTUNATE.

Marcus Aurelius the philosopher, who passes as a sage in paganism, does not hesitate to declare it weakness to pity the unfortunate, to weep with those who weep. Seneca says that mercy is a vice of the heart, hence good people should carefully avoid it. "The true sage," he says again, "is devoid of pity." The following, according to Cicero, are some of the precepts of Stoicism: no one is compassionate unless he is foolish or thoughtless; a true man never allows himself to be moved or touched; it is a misdemeanor and a crime to heed the promptings of compassion.

We would not cite these painful and deplorable facts, except that they enable us to appreciate the depth of the abyss whence Jesus Christ raised the human race. In a society where such maxims were universally accepted we can readily understand that the afflicted, the poor, the unfortunate, far from exciting pity, inspired generally contempt, disgust, and horror.

"To give food and drink to a poor man," says Plautus, "is a double folly: one loses what he gives, and prolongs the misery of another." "The poor," says Epictetus, "are abandoned like a dry, infected well, from which all turn with

disgust." At Athens as well as in Egypt a man who had no food and asked for it was punished by the law with death.

IV. WORKMEN.

As to labor, we may say that it was generally regarded with contempt among pagans; agriculture and all branches of industry were considered dishonorable. Cicero is loath to except in this general anathema medicine and architecture. Aristotle proclaimed labor not worthy of a free man. Plato was of the same opinion. Workmen were not regarded by the Greeks as worthy of the name of citizen. According to Terence, to be respected one must lead an idle life, and not be obliged to work for a livelihood.

No less painful things could also be related of the treatment of the aged, of debtors, of prisoners, but the facts supported by incontestable testimony, which we have just given, enable us to divine what must have been their fate in this society devoid of mercy.

III. The Family.[1]

We know to what a degree of degradation family life among pagans had fallen. Brutal selfishness took the place of mutual affection. The very weakness of women and children placed them in abject submission to the head of the family, who was not, as in Christian households, the spouse and father, but the master and tyrant. This state of things was only a logical consequence of the doctrines which prevailed.

A. Woman, in the eyes of pagan nations, was not man's companion and equal; she was an inferior being both as regards her origin and her destiny; her condition was absolute servitude. Greek philosophy, imitating the philosophy of China, India, Persia, and Egypt, has always been pitiless toward woman; it regarded her as an abject, unclean, wicked being, having no soul; hence her humiliating and degrading

[1] See references below on p. 541.

position; hence the practice of polygamy in the majority of nations, with its innumerable train of miseries; hence, among the Greeks and Romans, the habitual practice of divorce, no less disastrous in its consequences, and which could be obtained on the most frivolous and the vilest pretexts. Hence also the almost unlimited power of the husband over the wife, and of the father over the daughter. At every period of paganism, even among the most civilized people, the right of life and death which he exercised was recognized and guaranteed by the laws. A daughter, usually sold by her parents to the man she was to marry, became the personal property of her husband, and endured all the consequences of this position.

B. The Child.—Nor was the child treated any better; it was also completely in the power of its father. At Rome, when a child was born, it was laid at the feet of its father; if he took it in his arms, it was allowed to live; hence the expression *suscipere liberos*. If, on the contrary, he let it lie on the ground, the child was strangled, or thrown with the refuse into the great cesspool, or most frequently it perished of hunger. Infanticide and a thousand other revolting horrors were universally admitted and practised among pagan nations. Had not Tertullian been certain that he could not be contradicted, he would not have dared thus to apostrophize the pagans of his time: "Among those who surround us and who thirst for the blood of Christians, among you yourselves, O stern magistrates, so severe toward us, who is there who has not put his own child to death?"

Moreover, the philosopher Seneca observes on the same subject "that nothing is more reasonable than to remove useless things from the house;" and the grave Quintillian declares that "to kill a man is frequently a crime, but to kill one's own children is frequently a very beautiful action."

IV. Public Society and the Relations Between Nations.

A. If the head of the family oppressed all who depended upon him, he, in his turn, was a victim to the tyranny of the State. Among pagans there was no sentiment of the independence and the dignity of man; individuals existed only for the State; they were valued only in as far as they were capable of serving the country. Country was a divinity whose orders were to be obeyed at any price. "The State," says Fustel de Coulanges in *La Cité antique*, "considered the body and soul of each individual its property; hence its desire to mould this body and soul in such a way as to derive the greatest benefit from them. . . . The human person counted for very little before this holy and almost divine authority called country or State. . . . There was no guarantee for the life of a man when there was question of the interest of the commonwealth. . . . It was thought that right, justice, morality, everything should yield to the interest of the country. . . . The government called itself, by turns, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, but none of these evolutions gave man true liberty, individual liberty." "Paganism," says Balmes, "never seems to have dreamed that the end, the object of society was the welfare, the happiness of families and individuals." Hence the great Corneille had indeed reason to make one of his heroes say:

> "I thank the gods I am no Roman,
> I thus preserve a spark of nature human."

Every right and every sentiment of nature were outraged, insulted, violated in these pitiless constitutions of pagan antiquity. "All the power of the Romans was vested in Cæsar; Cæsar was the living law, the real divinity of the State" (Perin, *Les lois de la société chrétienne*, t. ii.). "We do not even find," says Laboulaye (*L'Etat et ses limites*), "that the ancients disputed with the master of the world

what seems to us to-day the most sacred right of the individual, I mean conscience, intelligence, labor. Religion, education, letters, commerce, industry, everything was in the hands of the emperor from the day when the people, willingly or unwillingly, transferred to Cæsar his sovereign power. Neither Trajan nor Marcus Aurelius doubted for a moment that his power was unlimited. They governed in the name of the people: to attempt to limit this power was a crime of high treason."

The worship of the God-State and the adoration of the emperors may, we acknowledge, have produced certain acts of fanatical patriotism, but certainly it was far from contributing to the happiness of citizens and of families.

B. The *relations between nations* were no less deplorable. In vain do we seek in paganism the idea of fraternity of nations, or the shadow of a principle of justice in their relations. To the Romans, society was Rome; to the Athenians, Athens. Outside of Rome and Athens there existed for them only coarse, barbarous peoples condemned to live isolated and uncultivated. If a man owed everything to his country, he recognized no rights in a strange nation. Each nation considered the other as enemies, consequently dreamed only of conquering one another. Hence wars were incessant and victories always cruel: the vanquished were massacred or reduced to slavery. The march of armies was only too frequently signalized by blood-stained ruins. The complete destruction of Carthage, Numantia, Corinth, and numerous other cities which were levelled to the ground, bear adequate testimony to the implacable cruelty of the conquerors. "Athens did not think she exceeded her right when she decreed that all the Mitylenians, without distinction of sex or age, were to be exterminated; when, the next day, she revoked her decree and contented herself with putting one thousand citizens to death and confiscating their lands she believed herself humane and merciful." (M. Fustel de Coulanges, l. c.)

ART. II.—THE STATE OF THE WORLD AFTER CHRIST, OR CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

I. A General Glance.

"If Christ had not appeared upon earth," says Laboulaye (l. c.), "I do not know how the world could have resisted the despotism which was stifling it. I do not speak here as a Christian, I set aside every religious question, and I am only an historian. In this character I affirm that, in politics as well as in morals and philosophy, the Gospel gave new life to souls. We have reason to date from the new era, for a new society sprang from the Gospel."

We have spoken elsewhere of the miraculously rapid propagation of the Church throughout the world known to the ancients. Therefore it was impossible for the world to remain as it was. At the same time, this marvellous change could not be the work of a day; it was wrought by slow but persevering labor. It is evident, moreover, that there must needs have been fierce war between paganism and the new religion; between the empire of Satan and the kingdom of Christ. On one side was material, brute force; on the other, truth and her invincible patience. Hence we see that Christian blood flowed for three centuries; but victory could not fail to crown the work of God. With Constantine the triumphant cross became a sign of honor, and by a truly providential dispensation, the heir of the Cæsars transferred the capital of the empire to Byzantium, as if to permit the seat of the spiritual power to be established at Rome, which had hitherto been the seat of the civil power.

The Church did not wait this brilliant triumph to begin her labor for the transformation of the pagan world. This work of civilizing nations began the very day when the head of the apostles, strengthened with power from on high, wrought his first conversions. In fact the Church by changing souls, by reforming the ideas, sentiments, and morals of individuals and families, transformed mankind.

In her doctrine, her laws, and her institutions she was the antithesis of pagan society: by the very fact of her propagation she must gradually transform the iniquitous laws and cruel institutions of the countries she subjected to her spiritual empire. "According as Christianity developed and realized the miracle of its universal propagation, Roman jurisprudence could not but be affected by the influence of Christian ideas: an indirect influence under the pagan emperors, a direct influence under the emperors converted to the new religion." A good summary of the principal characters of the civilization due to the Catholic Church is to be found in the twentieth chapter of Balmes' "European Civilization." Let us enter into a few details.

II. The Lot of Individuals.

I. Slaves and Gladiators.[1]

A. By her doctrines and her institutions the Church could not but ameliorate the condition of slaves, raise them from their state of shame and degradation and, finally, free them from their bonds. Thus she declares that the slave has the same origin, the same nature, the same destiny as his master; that his immortal soul is of the same value in the eyes of God; that he also has been redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ; that he has a right to seat himself at the same eucharistic banquet; that he may occupy even a higher place than his master in the kingdom of heaven, where the degree of glory is proportioned only to virtue and good works. "There is neither Jew nor Greek," says St. Paul, "there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii.).

[1] Leo XIII, Letter to the Bishops of Brazil, May 5, 1888, and Encycl. on Abolition of Slavery in Africa, Nov. 20, 1890; Parsons, Studies, VI., ch. 13; Brownlow; Balmes, ch. 15 ff.; Hughes, vol. i.; England, vol. iii.; Br. W. xv.; A. C. Q. ix. 358, xiii. 577; M., Jan., Feb. 1890.

"God is not a respecter of persons." "I beseech thee," says the same apostle to a master to whom he was writing in behalf of a runaway slave, "I beseech thee for my son whom I have begotten in my bonds, Onesimus . . . receive him, not now as a servant, but instead of a servant a most dear brother. . . . If he hath wronged thee in anything, put it to my account." Such is the doctrine of the Gospel. Without annihilating the distinctions necessary for the government of the world, without disturbing in any way the hierarchy of conditions and powers, without forgetting the *duties* of inferiors toward superiors, she publicly proclaims man's nobility before God. Could her doctrine fail to result in softening the lot of the slave and in gradually abolishing slavery itself?[1]

Let us remark, however, that the Church, despite her solicitude for these unfortunate creatures, never dreamed of abolishing slavery at *one blow;* this she had neither the right nor the power to do. Moreover, the political situation of the time did not permit a simultaneous and universal affranchisement: terrible disasters would have been the consequence of a general decree of abolition. We know that the whole social organization was then dependent upon slavery: industry, agriculture, commerce were in the hands of the slaves. Moreover, the slaves were not prepared for independence; to free them, before rescuing them from their state of moral degradation, before making them men and Christians, before securing them a means of subsistence, would have been to overthrow society, to organize a general

[1] Though there was much that was unjust and against nature in the treatment of slaves, yet it cannot be stated absolutely that slavery itself is contrary to nature. It can never be allowed to reduce man to a mere "thing," to arrogate to one's self an absolute right over the life and conscience of one's fellow man, to deprive him of the rights of husband and father. It is quite important to observe that such was not the slavery sanctioned by the Mosaic law, nor the institution of colonists (tenants) and serfs in the Middle Ages. Neither of these implied any idea whatever of moral or social degradation.

massacre in the world, and to condemn the slaves themselves to still greater misery.

Witness, for example, the evils which followed when the French Republic declared slaves in the colonies free. Interests connected with slavery had much to do with the disastrous Civil War in the United States between the North and the South. Both regarded the negro as a sort of domestic animal, but the South, in the interest of agriculture, wished to preserve slavery; and the North, in the interest of the manufactories, wished to abolish it. Faithful to the traditions of the Church, the bishops of America assembled in Council at Baltimore desired that the negroes be *gradually* freed.

It was wisdom on the part of the Church to move as she did, slowly: she could not proclaim the universal freedom of the slaves, but by employing the means in her power she efficaciously prepared the way for the complete suppression of slavery. Under her inspiration and after her example governments and individuals multiplied affranchisements, and the laws of Christian princes favored them. Meanwhile nothing was spared to render the condition of the unfortunate creatures more endurable. For further details of the abolition of slavery see the works of Balmes and Bp. England.

As to the barbarous traffic called the *slave trade*, the Church, always faithful to her doctrines, energetically protested from the first against this horrible preying of man upon man. Witness the noble and courageous language of the apostolic letters of Pius II., Paul III., Urban VIII., Benedict XIV. (1462, 1537, 1639, 1741). At the beginning of the present century Pius VII. succeeded in interesting the principal European governments in the holy work of emancipating slaves. Finally, Gregory XVI. issued, the 3d of November, 1839, new apostolic letters which afford additional proof of the Church's maternal solicitude for the victims of inhuman cupidity. And like testimony is furnished by the crusade organized under the patronage of Leo XIII. to deliver Africa from the horrible scourge which each year carries off

millions of free men to reduce them to the most cruel slavery. Let us pray that, seconded by European powers and by the devotion of generous hearts, the Church may bring happier days to this desolate land.

B. The gladiatorial combats, which nothing could excuse or justify in the eyes of a Christian, must naturally disappear with slavery. These cruel games had been proscribed by an edict issued in 392 in the name of Honorius and Arcadius. Yet the taste for these sanguina y spectacles was not stifled: it needed the blood of a martyr to abolish them completely. On the 1st of January, 404, when Rome was celebrating the election of the consuls, there appeared in the midst of the Coliseum a monk from the East named Almachius. He threw himself between the gladiators to separate them, then turning to the crowd said: "We celebrate to-day the octave of the coming of the Son of God, the King of peace; cease, then, these inhuman games invented by pagan cruelty." At these words a terrible tumult arose in the amphitheatre. The infuriated populace fell upon Almachius and tore him to pieces. The next day Honorius stopped the gladiatorial games.[1]

II. THE POOR AND THE UNFORTUNATE.[2]

The lot of the *poor*, of the *unfortunate*, of all the disinherited, was changed on the day when Christ said, "As long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matth. xxv. 40); and when He proclaimed the sentence to be given at the Last Judgment, "I was hungry and you gave Me to eat," etc. (ib. 35 ff.). He never ceased during all His life to repeat His precept, so new and strange to the pagan world, to love all men as our brethren, as we love ourselves,

[1] See Butler's Lives of the Saints, Jan. 1st.

[2] Baluffi; Mulhane; Lacordaire, l. c., conf. 33 on Cath. Doctr. and Soc'y; C. W. iv. 434, viii. 703, 734, xlvii. 470; D. R. New Ser. xxix. 361, xxx. 89, xxxi. 12; III., Ser. i. 26.

or, rather, as Christ has loved us. He Himself, moreover, chose to be born poor and to live in poverty; His apostles were poor; the poor and the unfortunate of every kind were the object of His special favor; it was for them specially that He wrought His miracles; He was severe only to the hard and pitiless rich. Is it astonishing, then, that the poor, the sick, the abandoned, the aged, all who were objects of contempt or a prey to suffering, found themselves in the first ages of Christianity surrounded with devoted care? Assistance of every kind was given to them with such ingenious tenderness that the pagans were forced to exclaim, "See how these Christians love one another!" Many were even attracted to the new religion by this hitherto unheard-of charity. And afterward how many benevolent institutions of every kind, how many religious orders were established to relieve the numberless miseries to which mankind is a prey! But let us not insist upon a truth so manifest and of which we have already spoken (pp. 240 ff).

III. WORKING CLASSES.

It is needless to say how the Church has elevated and ennobled *labor* and the *laborer*. The example of her Founder Himself and of His first apostles speaks with sufficient eloquence.[1]

How numerous are the institutions and laws created or inspired by her during eighteen centuries to lighten the lot of the working classes, to reconcile the various classes of society, to unite them by the powerful and indissoluble bond of Christian charity! The admirable works founded by the Church in favor of the working classes found their full development in the bosom of the guilds or confraternities of the Middle Ages.

[1] Leo XIII., Encyclicals on Socialism, etc., Dec. 28, 1878; on Workingmen, May 15, 1891, and on Christian Democracy, Jan. 18, 1901; D. R. Apr., July 1902 (Polit. Econ'y of Leo XIII.); Bayaert, ch. 6; Soderini; Nitti, Cath. Socialism; Bp. Spalding, Socialism, etc.

In the last century, unfortunately, the most fatal doctrines overthrew the edifice so patiently reared by the Church. The troubles and disorders which followed as an immediate consequence are known to the world. But the Church is never discouraged. She still labors with an ardor inspired by her maternal love to save society from the cataclysm which threatens it. Witness the admirable encyclical of Leo XIII. on the condition of the working classes, in which he indicates with so much wisdom the most effectual remedies for the too real sufferings of the working classes. The encyclical gives a complete programme of Christian economy, forming a striking contrast to the anarchistic egotism of the French Revolution. Thus the papacy, faithful to the traditions of the past, intervenes once more as mediator in the terrible social struggles of the present day.

III. Family Life.[1]

A. Woman.—In the eyes of the Church *woman* is no longer, as in pagan times, an inferior, degraded being, the slave of her husband, an object of contempt to her own children; she is the companion of man, the flesh of his flesh, the bone of his bone; she has resumed in the household the place of honor which belongs to her; she reigns there by virtue and love, as the husband by authority. It was by reestablishing the great law of the unity and indissolubility of marriage, raised to the dignity of a sacrament, that the Church restored to woman all her moral dignity. By presenting to the homage of the faithful a woman, Virgin and Mother, to whom

[1] Devas; Evans; Humphrey, S.J.; Monsabre; Riche, The Family; Woolsey; Lacordaire, l. c., conf. 34; Bp. Spalding, Socialism, etc., ch. 5; Br. W. iii., xii. 339, xiii. 526. On Marriage and Divorce see Leo XIII., Encycl., Febr. 10, 1880; A. C. Q. v. 312, viii. 385, xvi. 611; C. W. v., xvi. 585, 776, xxv. 340, xxxi. 550, xxxv. 11, xlviii. 23, 822; M. xlviii. 254; M. S. H., Jan., Febr. 1900. On Woman see A. C. Q. xi. 651; C. W. xv. 78, 255, 366, 487, xlv. 816; D. R. III. Ser. v. 288; Br. W. xviii.

Our Saviour Himself paid profoundest respect; by honoring widows, by making Christian virgins the object of special veneration, she has given to civilization one of its most indispensable elements.

B. THE CHILD.—The child in the eyes of the Christian is a son of God and heir to the kingdom of heaven; regenerated by Baptism, he becomes the temple of the Holy Spirit. Jesus Himself deigned to come into the world with all the weakness and miseries of infancy; in public life He showed special tenderness toward children; He even declared that we must become like them to enter the kingdom of heaven; finally, He pronounced terrible anathemas against all who would scandalize them. Therefore, children since the coming of Christ have become objects of tenderest solicitude; orphanages, nurseries, schools, colleges, all that the most delicate charity could invent, have been established for them.

IV. PUBLIC SOCIETY AND THE RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS.

A. From what we have said it is clearly evident that public society has been profoundly modified by the Church. In fact, by changing the ideas of individuals, by reforming family life, the Church transformed public opinion and public morals. No doubt vicious men did not completely disappear from Christian society, for man preserves with his imperfect liberty the possibility of failing in his duty, but vice was forced to hide its head, it became a dishonor, it no longer held the place it had held in pagan society.

By proclaiming that "all power comes from God," and that, though seated on a throne, princes and rulers are no less obliged to obey the laws of God and to govern their subjects by wise and just laws, the Church put an end to the tyranny of the State, which hitherto had recognized no will superior to its own. Thus, how far removed the legislation

of the reign of Nero from that of Theodosius,—that of Caligula from that of St. Louis!

By repeating at the same time to the governed the clear principle contained in the words of Jesus: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," the Church regulated the duties of subjects and abolished all they unjustly claimed as rights. The Christian readily submits to lawful authority, but this obedience is not abject, for it is paid to God's representative; he preserves, moreover, a noble independence, and when the commands of the human power positively contradict the divine or the natural law, the subject, taking refuge in the inviolable sanctuary of his conscience, proudly repeats the words of the apostles: *we cannot—non possumus!* "We must obey God rather than men."[1]

B. It is evident that international relations could not but assume a more humane and just character. Could peoples, convinced that all men are brethren, children of God and of the Church, continue to treat one another as barbarians and inhumanly destroy one another?

V. Transformation of Barbarous Nations.

A word remains to be said of the work of the Church in civilizing barbarous nations, who in the fourth and fifth centuries, particularly, invaded all parts of the Roman world. Roman society was, it would seem, too much weakened by the dissolvent action of paganism to be capable of a complete restoration. God used these barbarians as the ministers of His vengeance upon the persecuting empire, and at the same time to revive, after its conversion, the languishing West. It would seem as though the leaders of these savage hordes were conscious of their terrible mission: they called themselves the scourges of God. The spectacle Europe presented in the fifth century after it had been literally ravaged by them witnessed to the horrible cruelty

[1] Lacordaire, l. c., conf. 35.

with which these avengers sent by God accomplished their work. Let us content ourselves with a few brief quotations:

"In Spain"—it is the chronicler Idacius who speaks—"pestilence and famine followed closely in the bloody footsteps of the barbarians, and the public distress was so great that men fed upon the flesh of their fellow creatures, and mothers devoured their own children."

In Africa, St. Augustine was so grieved by the suffering which the Vandals inflicted upon the inhabitants of Hippo, and upon Africa in general, that he begged God to take him to Himself. "The saint beheld," says the historian Possidius, "cities ruined, villages destroyed, the inhabitants massacred or put to flight. Some had expired in torments, others had perished by the sword, others again, reduced to slavery, served pitiless masters. Those who escaped the conquerors took refuge in the woods or in the caves in the rocks, where they died of hunger and misery."

Italy was no less fortunate, for she was pillaged from one end to the other. The pillage of Rome by Alaric lasted three days; that of Genseric with his Vandals two weeks, and the ruin effected by the latter was so great that the word vandalism has become a synonym for destruction.[1]

The historian Guildas tells us that "the red tongue of incendiarism swept Great Britain from sea to sea; that fragments of towers and walls, stones of altars, blood-stained bodies lay heaped together in the public places, and that the only sepulchre for the dead was the houses in ruins, or the stomach of the wild beasts and birds of prey."

These horrible ravages no longer astonish us when we learn from history the physical, and particularly the intellectual and moral, condition of the barbarians. We can form some idea of it from the work of Ozanam, *Les Germains avant le Christianisme.* In chapter iii. we find that family life among these people differed little from that of the pagans, of which

[1] Allies, vol. iii.

we have given a brief sketch. Here also the head of the family was the tyrant to his wife, his children, and to his slaves. The warriors themselves, the only living power esteemed by the nation, were relegated to domestic duties with the women when age or infirmities rendered them incapable of brandishing a battle-axe: if they were unable to be of service, all that remained for them was to die. In Sweden, old men ended their days by being thrown from the top of high rocks; among the Heruli they were slain with sword-thrusts, for it was supposed that in order to be received by Odin into Walhalla one must bear the mark of the sword.

Neither in the tastes nor in the morals of the barbarians; neither in their political institutions nor in their religion, which was a sort of fetichism and flattered their instincts of murder and carnage, was there anything which showed them capable of regenerating the old society of Rome. Their invasion would inevitably have annihilated all civilization if the Church had not been at hand to subjugate the invaders and effect harmony between the conquering and the conquered race.

We have no need to state in detail the means by which the Church transformed these fierce spirits into the Christian nations which history presents to our admiration. Nourished by the same teachers, subjected to the same religious laws, obeying pastors chosen without distinction from the two races, kneeling at the same altars, partaking of the same eucharistic banquet, the Romans and the barbarians could not but end by being fused into one new people, destined to reap all the happy fruits of Christian civilization. Among the institutions especially fitted to civilize barbarous peoples we may mention the Truce of God, the right of asylum, and chivalry.[1]

But here again the transformation was not wrought in a day. The Church had a difficult task to enlighten the

[1] Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 19; Balmes, ch. 27.

intelligence, to subdue the will, to modify the customs and political institutions of these naturally fierce men. Several centuries were necessary to soften the savage harshness of these rude natures and temper the fervid heat of their blood; hence for a long time, side by side with the most heroic virtues and veritable marvels of holiness, we find sanguinary customs and monstrous crimes; but the Church, by force of perseverance and patient firmness, triumphed over the world of barbarism as she triumphed over the pagan world.

VI. Catholic and Protestant Nations.

Before pursuing this study of the civilizing influence of the Church, it may be well to refute, in a few words, a trite objection, which nevertheless impresses unthinking minds. It is founded on a comparison between Catholic and Protestant nations of Europe. There are not wanting men who affirm that the civilization of the latter is higher, and they do not hesitate to attribute the honor of this alleged superiority to Protestantism itself, and to hold it as a proof of the lawfulness of the Reformation. Let us mention a few principles which will suffice completely to destroy this objection.[1]

1. The falseness of Protestantism, as well as the truth of Catholicism, has been demonstrated by peremptory arguments. Until the force of such proofs is weakened, all conclusions of this kind will be absolutely of no value; they are merely a repetition of the gross sophism, *post hoc aut cum hoc, ergo propter hoc.* Simple anteriority or concomitance is in no way a relation of cause.

[1] Young; Haulleville; Balmes; Vaughan; Spalding, J. L., Essays; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essays 25-30, 43, 46; Newman, Anglican Difficulties, vol. i., pt. 2; Ricards, Cath. Chr.; ch. 14; Alnatt, The Church and the Sects, ll. 1, 2; Br. W. vii. 347, 517, xii. 309, xiii. 184, 201, 222 (same in C. W. x.); A. C. Q. viii. 1, xxv. 791; C. W. ix. 52, 845, x. 50, xi. 106, xxii. 577, 721, xxiii. 30, xxxiv. 1 (Ireland and England); D. R. New Ser. xxix. 418; U. B., Oct. '98.

2. Good is found where truth is. No doubt a false religion, by means of the truths which it has preserved, may be useful to the State, but it is no less true that religious truth, pure and entire, will necessarily be more productive of good to the State. Nor can it be otherwise, since true religion, at the same time that it enlightens the intelligence, communicates to the will the strength necessary to make our conduct in harmony with our belief, and thus contributes powerfully to the happiness of individuals, of families, and of society. Moreover, we have demonstrated by incontestable facts that Catholicism created modern civilization at a time when there was no question of Protestantism. What it did in the past is it not capable of doing in the present? Has truth or the nature of man changed?

3. A religious doctrine which denies free-will, which declares that faith alone is necessary for salvation, that good works are reprehensible and of no avail in the sight of God, which teaches the inadmissibility of justice—is it fitted to civilize nations, to procure them real peace and happiness? With such principles what must become of public as well as private morality? That innumerable Protestants do not carry these disastrous maxims into practice only proves that they are fortunately inconsistent, but it does not redound to the praise of Protestantism or to the credit of its civilizing power.

4. Even admitting that Protestant nations of the present day possess a higher civilization (taking the word in the sense of our opponents) than Catholic nations of Europe, yet it cannot be the effect of the religion, for, the same causes always producing the same effects, this superiority ought to have been evident in each of the preceding centuries since the beginning of the Reformation. Now history undoubtedly attests the contrary. To convince ourselves of this we have only to go back to the beginning of this century, when Napoleon I. was the arbiter of Europe. And before him it certainly was not Prussia or England

which held the balance of political power, but the most profoundly Catholic nations, Spain, France, and Austria. And if Protestantism is so preeminently civilizing, why are not Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, so long invaded by the Reformation, also at the head of civilized nations? On the contrary, if France has lost her political preponderance, it certainly has not been because her present government is too deeply attached to the Church.

5. We are far from admitting, moreover, the superior civilization claimed for nations separated from the Church. If it were only a question of political preponderance, of material riches, of commercial genius or matters of a like nature, we should have no difficulty in acknowledging that at the present moment the balance is manifestly in favor of Protestant nations. But a preponderance created by a few successful combats may rapidly disappear for contrary causes. Would civilization disappear at the same time with victory? Who would venture to claim that Prussia's success at Sadowa and Sedan was due to her religion? It would be only too easy to draw from the history of preceding centuries a diametrically opposite conclusion which tells in favor of Catholicism. Would you say, for example, that the invading barbarians were more civilized than the nations they conquered by their arms, or that the victorious Turks surpassed in civilization their fallen enemies? In paganism also there were rich and powerful nations, but their power and their riches were purchased at the price of human dignity, and individual liberty trampled under foot in millions of slaves by a small number of free men. Side by side with a few colossal fortunes there may be the greatest misery and still more deplorable degradation in the masses.

6. "The question of the primacy of nations," says Aug. Nicolas, "is of all things in the world the vainest, as long as we do not seek the standard which should serve as a basis of appreciation." This standard is certainly not wealth, or luxury, or commerce, or industries, or powerful manufactories, or

even political power; it is man himself, it is, above all, his soul, his intelligence, and his free-will. We have shown that the Catholic Church has done everything for individual liberty, for the advancement and sanctification of souls, and thus for the happiness of individuals and of society. Moreover, as we have repeatedly observed, the Church by no means despises material progress, the welfare of society; she encourages, blesses, and hails with acclamation the discoveries of science and the marvels of industry. But she cannot forget that man is not placed in this world for the enjoyment of temporal good, but, on the contrary, to love and serve God and merit heaven; she unceasingly tells him, on the authority of God's word, that it will avail him nothing to gain the whole world if he lose his soul. She does not wish that the "spirit be sacrificed to the body and the body to the machine," and she declares with the Psalmist, "Happy the people whose God is the Lord!" (Ps. cxliii.) In what way can such maxims, which moderate all the passions and favor all virtues, injure the true happiness of individuals, of families, and of nations, or hinder their triple development, material, intellectual, and moral? The decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount, which are the principle of all civilization, are nowhere taught more efficaciously than in the Catholic Church.

We might appeal to facts here, and compare the morality of Catholic and Protestant nations. But we do not think that statistics on this point are sufficiently advanced to enable us to form a complete judgment in the matter. Statistics, however, as they stand at present are not favorable to heretical nations. And if immorality is making alarming progress in Catholic countries, it is certainly not because the precepts of Catholicism are too faithfully observed by the people. We have shown, on the contrary, that the morality of the founders of Protestantism could not but foster, and did in reality cause, frightful immorality. (V. pp. 343 and 348.) Finally, even in Protestant countries the most moral

as well as the happiest parts of the country are those where Catholicism flourishes. As to the other provinces, we must not forget that they are still largely influenced by what they have retained of the teaching and practices of Catholicism which they formerly possessed. If immorality is not greater among them, it is *despite* the maxims of Luther and Calvin.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE.[1]

I. The Influence of the Church on Letters and Science.

The object of civilization, we have said, is the perfecting of the *whole man* in all that relates to the present life, and it includes not only his material interests, but also, and above all, his moral and intellectual interests.

It is of capital importance to provide for the *intellectual* perfection of man, for it is precisely his intelligence which distinguishes him from the animal. What part, then, has the Church taken in this civilizing labor? We would state it briefly before concluding this chapter. It will afford still another answer to a charge already refuted, but which is as wide-spread as it is unjust.

Let us begin first of all by recalling what we have said elsewhere, viz., that the *sole, proper, direct* mission of the Church, the end of her foundation, is to preserve the deposit of Revelation brought by Jesus Christ, and to communicate it to men of good-will, to enable them to attain salvation. Therefore, even though the Church had not labored for the intellectual progress of humanity it could not be alleged as a charge against her. Who would think of accusing a *com-*

[1] Azarias; Brennan; Townsend; Drane; Allies, ii., iii., v.; Thébaud; Maitland; Zahm; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essays 4 ff.; Balmes, ch. 69 ff.; Newman, Anglican Difficulties, vol. i., pt. 2, l. 8; Historical Sketches, vol. iii. (universities); Br. W. ix. 457, 568; A. C. Q. i. 504; viii. 264, xiii. 255, xvii. 263; xxv. 456, xxvii. 105; C. W. v., vi., xvi. 74, 145, xxi. 721, xliv. 145; D. R. III. Ser. i. 1, xiv. 243, July '97, July '99. See also references p. 554.

mercial society of not promoting literature, or an academy of sciences of not producing sculptors or musicians? It would be no less absurd to attack the Church on the ground that she had not contributed to the advancement of science and letters.

Nevertheless, this Church which exercised such a salutary influence upon the *ancient world;* which prepared the way for the abolition of, and even to a great extent abolished, the crying abuses which will be the eternal dishonor of paganism; which can boast of having *indirectly* and *over and above its spiritual influence* civilized the barbarous nations established on the ruins of the Roman Empire, has also acquired claims to the gratitude of nations for *special* benefits in the intellectual order.

1. The proper work and mission of the Church is the moral and religious teaching of all mankind; yet the duty of teaching imposed upon her ministers has never excluded the various forms of knowledge which may adorn the human intelligence. The Church's care of man, so dear to God, saved by His precious blood, must extend to the *whole man.* The human sciences, moreover, are far from being useless for the sublime end of Christianity. They help the soul to grasp more promptly the *fundamental* principles of faith and the virtues which it teaches. They open a passage, as it were, through which these virtues enter the intelligence more easily and penetrate more deeply. Thus we find the Church inscribes in her laws, in her *canon law,* these two sentences which express her thought with energetic brevity: "Ignorance is the mother of all error. Ignorance is hardly tolerable in a layman, but in a priest it is inexcusable and unpardonable." Who does not know St. Basil's homily on "The profit which young men may derive from the reading of profane authors?" St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome were of like opinion, and employed their leisure in spreading knowledge in the society which they were endeavoring to win to God. "The first of bless-

ings," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, one of the greatest Doctors of the Church, "is knowledge; and I mean not only that which relates to salvation and the beauty of spiritual things, I speak also of profane knowledge. To have only morality or science is to have but one eye, but those who shine in both are perfect."

Such has also been the theory and the practice of the Church. Recently the Vatican Council, speaking of scientific studies, solemnly declared in its first dogmatic constitution "that, far from being opposed to the study of the arts and the sciences, the Church assists and encourages them in numerous ways; for she knows, and does not despise, the advantages which result from them to the life of man. Moreover, as sciences come from God, the Master of all sciences, the Church recognizes that the regular employment of them should, with the assistance of grace, lead man to God. Certainly she does not forbid that the sciences, each in its own sphere, make use of their proper principles and special methods."

Why, moreover, should the Church fear science? Has she not just proclaimed by the authentic organ of the same Council that *no real conflict is possible* between natural truth and revealed truth, between human science and the revealed word, between faith and reason? We ourselves have demonstrated in the first part of this work that no such conflict exists. God is the author of all being, and therefore the author of all truths, whatever the order to which they belong.

2. Not content with promoting all that can extend the sphere of human knowledge, the Church has always been the most ardent centre of intellectual activity. "From the fourth century," says the Protestant Guizot, "the intellectual state of religious society and that of civil society could not be compared: in one all was decadence, languor, and inertia; in the other movement, ardor, and progress." In the bosom of Christianity minds were unceasingly quickened by serious

and profound discussions. The accepted maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas,* was largely practised. "Examine the government of the Church," writes the same author again; "it appeals unceasingly to reason; liberty dominates. What are its institutions, its means of action? Provincial councils, national (plenary) councils, general councils, continued correspondence, continual publication of letters, admonitions, writings. Never did government carry common discussion and deliberation so far." It was in the general councils, particularly, that this intellectual life was manifested, and we may say with a writer that "even had their decisions not been the work of divine inspiration they would still remain as the most beautiful monuments of human wisdom." (M. de Decker, *L'Eglise et l'ordre social chrétien.*)

"The old world is no more," says a judicious writer, "but its learning has survived it. The Church has made her own the *two languages* which were the instruments of its thought and the vehicle of its knowledge: in appropriating them she has immortalized them, and in immortalizing them she *saved* the ideas with which they were impregnated, the notions of which they were the receptacle, in a word, *all the intellectual treasure amassed in them;* for a language is like a stream of running water which holds in suspension all the elements of the life of a people." (*De l'Eglise dans ses rapports avec le développement intellectual,* by the Abbé Pirenne.)

3. What a magnificent array of thinkers and writers is offered us in the annals of the Church! She had hardly emerged from the catacombs, this Church based on the inspired books of the Old and the New Testament, than there rose for her defence men like Origen, Athenagoras, Justin, Tertullian; later she produced the works of writers like John Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Leo the Great; later still she inspired the masterpieces of Albert the Great, of Anselm, of Bonaventure, of Thomas Aquinas. Who may count the re-

markable works, published in every language, setting forth, demonstrating, developing, and defining religious truth? We cannot forget that the most beautiful *literary works* of every kind are due to Christian inspiration; to be convinced of this it suffices to mention "Jerusalem Delivered," "The Divine Comedy," "Polyeucte," and "Athalie." If paganism had its century of Pericles and Augustus, Christianity produced that of Leo XIII. and Louis XIV.; if the first excelled especially in literary form, the others surpassed them in truth and elevation of thought, and in heroic sentiments.

4. Historians who have made a serious study of the Middle Ages[1] justly affirm that during this long period the influence of the Church was the only thing which held its own, and which exercised its empire in the intellectual world. "The Church," says Guizot himself, "exercised a great influence over the moral and intellectual order in Europe. . . . The moral and intellectual developments of Europe have been essentially theological." It was this development of minds which rendered possible the literary works of the beautiful Christian centuries, as well as the great scientific discoveries at the end of the fifteenth century, and those which followed as a consequence in later centuries.

Had the Church done nothing more than save the masterpieces of pagan literature, she would still merit the gratitude of all. When Europe was sacked by barbarous powers and beheld all her libraries destroyed, it was the monks who rescued from fire and pillage the manuscripts which we still possess.

[1] On the work of the Church in the Middle Ages see Digby; Maitland; Allies, vol. iv. ff.; Thébaud, Church and Moral World, ch. 6, 7; Lilly, Chapters, vol. i., Claims, etc., ch. 4; Alnatt, Which is the True Church, suppl.; Shahan, Catholicism in the Middle Ages; Br. W. x., xii.; Hergenröther, Cath. Church, etc., vol. i., Essay 6; Parsons, Studies, II., ch. 1; A. C. Q. xiii, 589; C. W. v. 207, 397 (libraries, universities), xxiii. 79 (commerce), xxv. 459, xxix. 358, xxxii. 262, 354, 650 (education), xxxiii. 377 (female education); D. R. Old Ser. xvii. 159, xxviii. 50, xxx. 273, New Ser. xix. 294, xxviii. 378 (how to study the M. A.); I. E. R., Dec. '99 (morality).

And when there was no means of multiplying these works, these same monks, in their cells or in the scriptorium, transcribed them and spread numerous copies. They devoted to these labors the leisure left them from the education of children and of young men, from the cultivating and redeeming of lands, and from the construction of many of the magnificent cathedrals which are to be found in Europe.

Much might be said in regard to other services of every kind which the monasteries rendered society. While Guizot affirms that the Benedictines cultivated the soil of Europe, the rationalist Gibbon declares that "one convent of these religious probably did more for letters than the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge." "An abbey," says A. Thierry, "was not only a place of prayer and contemplation, but it was also a public asylum against the invasion of barbarism. Beside being a refuge for books and the sciences, it contained workshops of every kind, and its lands were model farms. It was the school to which the conquerors came to learn how to cultivate and colonize the lands they had acquired."[1]

5. And the Popes particularly, what have they not done for intellectual culture? "I should never conclude," says Mgr. Freppel, "if I were to enumerate all the services rendered by the papacy to the cause of science and letters. Shall I point out to you a Pope at the head of the Latin and Greek renaissance; the refugees from Constantinople seeking protection under the shadow of the pontifical throne; Lascaris teaching Greek to astonished Europe on the Esquiline beside the palace of Leo X.; Nicholas V. maintaining a legion of scholars for the collection of manuscripts in all parts of the world; Pius II., the learned Æneas Sylvius, mingling his own knowledge with the brilliant lights of his protégés?

[1] Montalembert; Feasey; Belloc; Henry; Newman, Hist. Sketches, II., ch. 3, 4; Allies, viii.; Balmes, ch. 38–47; Gasquet, The Engl. Bible, ch. 6 ff. (on Convent Schools); Lacordaire, l. c., conf. 36; A. C. Q. vii. 331, xi. 597; D. R. Old Ser. xvii. 376, xxx. 273.

And to come nearer to our own day, shall I cite Paul III. encouraging Copernicus in his immortal discoveries; Gregory XIII. furnishing from astronomy a more accurate distribution of time; Sixtus V. developing that Vatican library which has been the admiration of the world; Urban VIII., whose Latin poems are justly regarded as among the best productions of the kind in modern times; and, finally, that grand Benedict XIV., to whom Voltaire himself renders homage, hailing him as the most learned man of the eighteenth century?" Each one's thoughts naturally turn here to the Pope gloriously reigning, who by his learning, his writings, and his works leads the march of contemporary civilization. Who does not know the admirable zeal with which Leo XIII. favors and recommends the higher studies, whether in literature, language, natural science, history, philosophy, theology, in a word, in all the branches of human knowledge? "Nothing," he wrote recently, "is more noble than literary glory." Thus he earnestly extols the study of Roman and Greek authors. "The models of Greece," he says, "shine and excel to such an extent, and in every respect, that one cannot conceive of anything more polished and more perfect." The end the Holy Father has in view is evident; it is, as he himself says, "that truth enlightened by the splendor of thought and style may more easily penetrate, and be more deeply graven in minds." Moreover, his grand intelligence and noble heart are keenly interested in all that can contribute to the elevation and to the welfare of humanity.[1]

It is, therefore, a historical fact that in every period of the

[1] There is, however, a science which Leo XIII. condemns, the science which plunges into matter and proclaims it eternal; the science which reduces man to the level of the brute, and which by its extravagances shakes the foundation of all moral, domestic, and civil order. There is also a civilization which the Pope repudiates: "It is certainly not that by which man is perfected in the threefold manner we have mentioned; no, it cannot be that, since the Church, so far from contesting it, lends it her most efficacious concurrence. It

Christian world the papacy has always presided over scientific and literary movements, just as it has been at the head of religious and social movements.[1]

II. The Church and the Fine Arts.[2]

In regard to the Church's influence on the progress of the fine arts, we must needs confine ourselves to a few brief but significant words. "Take away the monuments of Christian art from the time of the catacombs to the present day; eliminate from public and private collections all the marvels of painting and sculpture due to Christian genius, and you will have," as Armengaud justly observes in his *Les œuvres de l'art chrétien*, "the best proof of this fact, viz., that religion was the sole inspiration of great art, the founder of all the rival schools, and the nursing mother of artists. It belonged to her and to her alone to complete the sublime beauty of pagan form by the still more sublime beauty of Christian sentiment: ancient art had deified matter, modern art has breathed into a soul." And to cite only Italy, look at the glorious array of Christian painters who made the age from Leo X. to Urban VIII. illustrious: Fra Bartolomeo, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Perugino, Andrea del Sarto, Correggio, Giulio Romano, Daniel de Volterra, Michael Angelo, Palma the elder, Titian, Paul Veronese, Tintoretto, the Caravaggios, Guido, and Domenichino. Was it not Canova, the great modern sculptor, who wrote Napoleon: "All religions foster art, but none in the same degree as ours"? After a period

is a civilization which would supplant Christianity and destroy with it all the good with which it has enriched us."

[1] On the Renaissance see Pastor, vol. i., Introd.; Lilly, Claims, etc., ch. 5; C. T. S., vol. 45; Einstein.

[2] Rio; Wiseman, Essays, vol. vi.; Kenrick, l. c., § 1; Spalding, J. M., Miscell., Essay 4; Spalding, J. L., Essays, p. 306; A. C. Q. ix. 625, xiv. 234, xv. 228; C. W. i. 246, iv. 546, v., xv. 518, xxxv. 133, xlv. 398, lxxi. 815; D. R. New Ser. iii. 402, xi. 234; M., July 1900, Febr. 1901.

of lamentable indifference, our age cannot now extol sufficiently the marvels of architecture, of sculpture, and of painting of the Middle Ages. We justly admire the grave and touching melodies of the Gregorian chant, and the learned compositions of Orlando de Lassus, of Palestrina, of Allegri. A master on hearing them in the Sistine Chapel exclaimed: "I have been listening to the angels, and repeating what they sang."

While the Church thus gave souls, with the possession of truth, the sentiment of the beautiful and the desire to express it in art, the reformers of the sixteenth century seeing only superstition in the pomp of our altars, idolatry in the numerous masterpieces which adorned our churches, remorselessly destroyed these marvels of Catholic art. "The Reformation," says Chateaubriand, "penetrated with the spirit of its founder, an envious and barbarous monk, declared itself the enemy of the arts. In withdrawing the imagination from the faculties of man, it cut the wings of genius and arrested its flights. . . . If the Reformation had been completely successful in the beginning, it would have established, at least for a time, another species of barbarism. . . . Europe, in fact the whole world, is covered with monuments of the Catholic religion. We owe it this Gothic architecture which equals in details and surpasses in grandeur the monuments of Greece."

III. The Church and Education.[1]

I. POPULAR EDUCATION.

Religious and moral teaching forms the basis of all true civilization, or rather of society itself. If it does not rest upon certain fundamental truths, admitted and practised by the masses, not only the prosperity but the very existence of society is constantly endangered. This is particularly

[1] See references above, p. 550.

true in the troubled times in which we live. Victor Hugo himself bears witness to this truth in his address to the national assembly, Jan. 15, 1850. "Religious teaching," he says, "is, in my opinion, more necessary to-day than ever. The more a man advances, the more he should believe. The evil, I might almost say the one evil of our time, is a tendency to stake all on this present life. In making temporal, material life the object and end of man we aggravate all his miseries by the negation which this implies: to the burden of misfortune we add the insupportable weight of future nothingness, and that which was only suffering, that is, a law ordained of God, becomes despair, that is, the law which reigns in hell. Hence the great social convulsions of the day. Certainly, I am of those who desire to alleviate in this life the material condition of those who suffer; but I do not forget that the first means of alleviation is to give them hope. How our finite miseries diminish when we are sustained by an infinite hope! The duty of us all, whether legislators, bishops, priests, writers, is . . . to make all look up to heaven, to direct all souls, to turn all expectations toward a future life, where justice will be done, where wrongs will be righted. Let us clearly proclaim it: no one will have suffered unjustly or in vain. Let us not forget, and let us impress upon all that life would be robbed of its dignity, it would not be worth living if all ended with this world, if annihilation were to be our lot. That which lightens labor, which sanctifies work, which makes man good, wise, patient, benevolent, just, and at the same time humble and great, worthy of intelligence, worthy of liberty, is having before him the perpetual vision of a better world shining through the darkness of this life."[1] There are men, nevertheless,

[1] "Fly," says J. J. Rousseau himself, "fly those who, under pretext of explaining nature, sow desolating doctrines in the hearts of men. Overturning, destroying, trampling under foot all that men respect, they rob the afflicted of their last consolation in their misery; they take from the powerful and the rich the only curbs of their

who think otherwise: blinding themselves to the truth, they can conceive of no salvation for peoples save through the spread of letters and science. Yet if they are in good faith, they must recognize that, even on this ground, the Church deserves the gratitude of all who are friends of the people.

There is, in effect, no historical fact more solidly established than that of the Church's care for the instruction of the masses.

1. What is the preaching of the Gospel but a marvellously efficacious means of intellectual culture for nations? We have said elsewhere that preaching is essential to the Church. For by means of it the heavenly doctrine is spread throughout the world.[1] What had been said of the prophet Christ applied to Himself: The spirit of the Lord has sent Me to preach the Gospel to the poor (Luke iv. 17 ff.). And His apostolic life was a continual preaching to the multitude. His disciples, after His example, went through the world announcing the truth which enlightens and purifies. "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel," exclaims the Apostle of nations (1 Cor. ix. 16. See also Rom. x. 18, where Ps. xviii. 5 is applied to the Apostles). "There is no religion," says Bergier, "which has inspired its followers with so much zeal for the instruction of the ignorant as Christianity; none which has produced such a large number of scholars; with the exception of Christian nations, nearly all are still ignorant and barbarous; those who have had the misfortune to re-

passions; they wrest from the depths of hearts remorse for crime and hope of virtue, and yet boast that they are the benefactors of the human race. Truth, they protest, can never be harmful to men. I agree with them. And this, in my opinion, is a great proof that what they teach is not the truth."

[1] On Catholic and Protestant missions see Wiseman, Lect. on Doctrines of the Ch., ll. 6, 7; Marshall, Christ. Missions; Alzog, Ch. Hist., III., p. 401 ff.; 921 ff.; Card. Moran in C. T. S. xxix.; the interesting articles by Rev. A. H. Atteridge, S.J., in D. R. July '84, Apr. '85, Jan. '87, Jan., Oct. '89; Archbp. Spalding, Evidences, l. 4; A. C. Q. Oct. 1901.

nounce Christianity have promptly relapsed into barbarism." And this phenomenon is all the more remarkable that, as Ozanam justly observes, paganism was never preached; never did the ancient religions speak to the people assembled in their temples.[1] Now it cannot be disputed that the knowledge of religious truths taught by the Church constitutes, of itself, the richest treasure of the intelligence. The *catechism*, it has been justly said, is the philosophy of the *people*. Theodore Jouffroy, one of the representatives of infidel philosophy, could not but acknowledge this. Hear what he said to his numerous auditors at the Sorbonne, speaking of the summary of Catholic doctrine. "There is a little book which children are taught, and upon which they are questioned at church; read this little book, which is the Catechism: you will find in it a solution of all the questions I have proposed to you, of all without exception. Ask the Christian the origin of human species, ask whither he is going, how he is going, he will tell you. Ask that poor child why he is on this earth, what is to become of him after his death: he will give you a sublime reply, which he will not understand, but which is no less admirable. Ask him how the world was created and for what end; why God placed in it animals and plants; how the earth was peopled, whether by one family or by many; why men speak several languages; why they suffer; why they struggle, and how all this is to end: again he will tell you. Ask him concerning the origin of the world and the origin of species, questions of race, the destiny of man in this life and in the next, man's relations with God, the duties of man toward his fellow creatures, the rights of man over creation: he will be equally able to answer. And when he is a man he will hesitate no less concerning natural right, political right, international right, for all this comes, flows clearly, as of itself, from Christianity. This is what I call a grand religion; I recognize it by this sign: that it leaves unanswered no question which interests humanity."

[1] See the beautiful pages of Lacordaire, conf. 24 on Cath. Doc.

2. *Wherever the Church has raised a temple she has built a school.* All authors who have written on the beginnings of the Church are unanimous in pointing out the existence in the first centuries of a cathedral school in each diocese. The Anglican Bingham in his celebrated book on Ecclesiastical Antiquities, the learned Thomassin in his still more celebrated work, "Ancient and Modern Ecclesiastical Discipline," Launoi, Lingard, Louis Nardi, and a multitude of others make this very clear. The learned Benedictine authors of *l'Histoire littéraire de la France,* writing of the state of letters in Gaul in the first centuries, say that "a Christian school invariably followed the erection of a parish church." And after relating how "the Church and monastic orders in the sixth century were the harbors where all that remained of letters and sciences were saved from total shipwreck," they add: "The cathedrals still had their schools where the same method of teaching was followed as in the *early centuries.*" It is to be noted that before the triumph of the Church under Constantine there were no parochial churches, only bishoprics: the flock was governed directly by the bishop assisted by a few priests. Later, when dioceses were divided into parishes, parochial schools were added to the cathedral schools.

To appreciate the interest which *the Church has always taken in the education and instruction of the people,* we have only to open a collection of the Councils. At every period we find these learned and holy assemblies occupied with the question of education, and recommending it to the enlightened care of pastors of souls. In the sixth century the Council of Vaison cites the example, already old, of Italy, to remind the priests of Gaul of their grave obligation to elevate and instruct youth. In the eighth century we find Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, beloved by Charlemagne for his learning and his virtues, issuing the following decree, which is reproduced word for word in the capitularies or ecclesiastical statutes of England of that time: "Let the priests maintain schools in the market-towns and in the country; and if

any of the faithful wish to entrust their little children to them to be instructed in letters, let them not refuse to receive and instruct them; but, on the contrary, let them teach them with perfect charity. And in instructing the children let them require no salary, and receive nothing except whatever the parents voluntarily offer through affection and gratitude."

We might cite a number of other Councils, for example, that of Aix-la-Chapelle in 789, of Thionville in 805, of Mayence in 813, of Rome in 826, of Paris in 829, of Valence in 885, all of which spoke in analogous terms.

Charlemagne was most anxious for the education of his people. Ansegis, Abbot of St. Vandrille, says, in his collection of the great Christian emperor's capitularies: "Charlemagne desired that there be schools in all the monasteries and in all the bishoprics in order that the children of free men as well as those of serfs be taught grammar, music, and arithmetic."

We would also mention the eighteenth canon of the Third Ecumenical Council of Lateran, held in 1171. Addressed to the universal Church, it faithfully expresses the thought of the Church herself: "The Church like a pious mother is bound to see that the poor whose parents cannot afford to educate them shall not, for this reason, be deprived of facilities for learning and making progress in letters and science; therefore, we command that in all the cathedrals a master with a suitable salary be provided for the free instruction of clerks and all *poor scholars*."

In fact, as Allain says in his erudite work, *L'instruction primaire en France avant la révolution*, "the history of education of every degree in the early part of the Middle Ages is simply the history of the Church's efforts to preserve the sciences, and to save the threatened civilization. From the fifth to the twelfth century the clergy alone were occupied with questions relating to education; and if we would have an idea of the intellectual state of our fathers in those remote

periods, we must have recourse to the ecclesiastical records, we must study the Councils."

The same state of affairs prevailed in Germany as in France. In a work entitled *L'instruction populaire dans l'Allemagne du Nord*, Rendu, Inspector-General of the University of France, speaking of the time preceding the Revolution, expresses himself thus: "Catholicism had peopled Germany with popular schools like the rest of Europe; it required that the clergy call to these schools the children of serfs as well as free men; that every priest having charge of souls should give instruction himself, or have it given by a clerk; that the bishops, in their turn, should take care to build schools where there were none; that the curate of each parish should offer the poor free instruction. Catholicism did more; anticipating the thought of J. B. de la Salle, the disciples of Gerard Van Groote taught poor children writing, reading, religion, and a few mechanical arts. From the Netherlands, their native country, this brotherhood of the fourteenth century carried the light of their charity to both shores of the Rhine, to Westphalia, to Saxony, to Pomerania, to Prussia and Silesia. At the same time, monasteries of women had provided the young girls of the people with teachers which the Reformation took from them. . . . Thus Catholicism had laid the corner-stone of popular education as well as of higher culture."

It is not astonishing, therefore, that in the sixteenth century the Council of Trent found nothing to change in the work of the education of the people, and that it was content to give it its final perfection by the creation of the *Petits Séminaires*.

The work of popular instruction by no means declined in the two centuries that followed. Before 1789 France, for example, was covered with schools for the instruction of the people. Paris alone had at least five hundred. Even the small villages were not without them, as we learn from the terms of article twenty-five of the edict of 1695: "The

superintendents, preceptors, masters, and mistresses in the small villages shall be approved by the curates of the parishes, or other ecclesiastics empowered to do so." In 1771 Guy de Rousseau de Lacombe, advocate of the Parliament of Paris, writes: "Our late kings have united in their ordinances the dispositions of their predecessors and those of the Councils, and finding schools established almost everywhere, they have been watchful to maintain their discipline and to have them well attended." "Each parish usually has," says Daniel Jousse in a treatise written in 1709, "two *charity schools* for poor children, one for boys and one for girls."

In a learned work of Ch. de Robillard de Beaurepaire, the fruit of patient research, we find that in the ancient diocese of Rouen there were 835 schools for boys and 306 schools for girls, dispersed through the 1159 parishes visited by Mgr. d'Aubigné. Analogous works attest the same care on the part of the Church for the other dioceses of France.

In concluding the ninth chapter, entitled *L'Eglise et l'instruction primaire,* M. Allain expresses himself in the following terms: "Whoever shall have read dispassionately these extracts from our ancient synodal ordinances will be convinced, I hope, of the zeal with which the Church labored for the diffusion of primary education, and of the profound wisdom of the regulations she made for masters and scholars. The diocesan statutes of the last two centuries are an imperishable monument of her devotion to the interests of education; they demonstrate the extent of her solicitude for this important work and the intelligent care she bestowed on it. Those who dare to say that if anything was done in France for primary instruction, it was done without the Church, and in spite of her, show that they are absolutely ignorant of her legislation and her works."

What we have said proclaims with eloquence the devotion of the clergy to the great work of popular education. Not content with exhorting, they preached by example, performing the duties of teachers themselves at need, founding

schools and robbing themselves to endow them. We have here striking and numerous facts, the authority of which is not weakened nor the memory effaced because there are writers who dare to assert, without the shadow of proof, that, "though the Catholic faith predominated for many centuries, it did nothing toward founding primary schools." And, incredible as it may seem, even the Revolution in its famous preface to the law of August 18, 1792, did not hesitate to proclaim that "the Brothers (of the Christian Schools) merited well of the country." Nor is this unequivocal testimony astonishing, for at the death of Blessed de la Salle his disciples had schools in almost all the provinces of France, and we know that their instruction was free. In fact it was complained that they were too numerous: "Our market towns and our villages," said in 1773 the magistrates and prominent citizens of Saint-Dié "swarm with schools; there is not a hamlet without its pedagogue." These are facts which the calumniators of the Church should not ignore. Perhaps they are also ignorant of Voltaire's opinion in regard to the education of the masses. We shall confine ourselves to quoting the following from a great number of similar sentiments written by this man who so heartily despised the people: "The laborer does not deserve to be educated; it is sufficient for him if he knows how to handle the pick-axe, the plane, or the file." "There must needs be ignorant beggars." "The good bourgeois, not the workman, should be educated." As to the people, "they must be made to wear the yoke eternally and feel the goad."

It would be interesting to contrast the action of the Church with what was done for the education of the people by the French Revolution, which certain writers credit erroneously with so many excellent things. But for lack of space we shall limit ourselves to saying that the Revolution began in 1792 by abolishing all the primary schools together with the five hundred and sixty-two colleges then existing; as to the universities, one only, that of Strasburg, was allowed,

because of its Protestantism, to remain; the twenty-three others were suppressed. The lands and revenues of these institutions were of course confiscated and the former faculty found themselves dismissed, or obliged to apostatize. And what was offered in their place? High-sounding decrees, in spite of which the learned Chaptal, then Minister of the Interior in France, says in 1801, "public education has almost ceased; the generation which has just reached its twentieth year is irrevocably sacrificed to ignorance; the primary schools have almost disappeared."

No doubt the Empire and the succeeding governments endeavored to repair the evil caused by the Revolution, but their labor consisted only in restoring, to a certain extent, the ruins accumulated by free thought. This does not justify them, however, in attacking the Church, which for centuries had done so much better and so much more for the interests of education.

We must not imagine that free schools are an invention of modern times. The majority of the schools, colleges, and universities of the Middle Ages were founded and maintained by Catholic liberality.[1]

II. UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE EDUCATION.

University Education.—There is much to be said of the important service rendered by the Church to philosophy, literature, and science, but we must confine ourselves to a few leading facts.[2]

[1] The free schools of those ages were the result of spontaneous donations, and not, like most of the present day, supported by public tax,—an additional burden imposed alike upon the poor and the rich, under penalty of fine or imprisonment. Think of the enormous sums required every year by the bureau of education in most of the countries of Europe!

[2] Cf. Rashdall's excellent work.

It is well known that all the numerous and flourishing universities of the Middle Ages were, from the eleventh and twelfth century, founded by the Church, or sought her approval or protection. To be sure, they were favored and patronized by kings, but it is absolutely incontestable that they grew and prospered under the shadow of the Holy See. The Popes in the bulls of erection gave as a reason therefor the duty incumbent upon them to dissipate the darkness of ignorance, to spread and encourage the teaching of all the sciences. Hence the name, University, *Universis scientiis*. From the thirteenth century the Oriental languages were taught in them, and in 1311 the General Council of Vienna made these studies obligatory in the principal universities. Let us remark further that the first collection for the history of natural sciences was due to Pope Pius V. (1566–1572), and that as early as the thirteenth century the Vatican possessed a botanical and medical garden.

While the universities received their statutes and their powers from the Pope, they were justly proud of numbering among their illustrious masters such men as St. Anselm, St. Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, Albert the Great, Duns Scotus, and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The number of their scholars corresponded to the high grade of the teaching given. In the fifteenth century, when the Protestant Reformation had overturned Catholic Europe, the Universities of Zwolle, Bois-le-Duc, Cologne, Deventer numbered respectively 800, 1200, 2000, 2200 students. The University of Vienna harbored 3000, and even 7000 under Maximilian I.; the University of Paris, it is said, and that of Cracow had as many as 15,000. The universal use of the Latin tongue in the universities caused students from all parts of the world to flock to them. In Belgium the University of Louvain, founded in the fifteenth century by Martin V., enjoyed the most brilliant reputation. According to Justus Lipsius it numbered from 7000 to 8000 scholars and 2000 law students. No poor scholar was refused, Catholic charity

having provided in advance for all their needs. In this city alone there were more than forty colleges or houses where poor scholars, conspicuous for talent or application, were gratuitously lodged and fed. M. Laurentie says that the single university of Paris distributed six hundred and nineteen scholarships founded by the clergy for poor students.

Colleges.—As to the colleges, that is, the schools which, with religion, included specially the study of classic antiquity, they were to be found even in the most unimportant cities. They were generally under the administration of the chief magistrates, but nearly all the instruction was given by the clergy, who had, moreover, undisputed right of supervision. Here again it was Christian charity which richly endowed these numerous establishments, founded scholarships, and erected public libraries.

We find in the recent and remarkable work of Albert Duruy, *L'instruction publique et la révolution*, interesting statistics in regard to our subject. We learn that before 1789 France with a population of twenty-five million inhabitants, had 562 colleges with 72,747 scholars. About 40,000 of this number received gratuitous or almost gratuitous instruction. To-day the official records show to a population of thirty-eight million inhabitants only 81 lyceums and 325 colleges with 79,321 scholars; of these only 4949 receive scholarships of more or less importance. In the single province of Franche-Comté there were more scholarships than there are to-day in all France. These figures speak eloquently and dispense with all commentary. We see that Chevalier had indeed reason to say that "since the Revolution and the suppression of religious orders there has been a strange retrogression in regard to secondary education."

Let us conclude, as the learned Hurter observes in his *History of Innocent III.*, that "only superficial minds, who have not studied historical records, who are either blinded by the alleged superiority of their day, or instigated by

persistent hatred, dare to accuse the Church of having favored ignorance."

We cannot conclude this chapter better than by quoting a beautiful page of Balmes in which, presenting a brief picture of European civilization, he shows the Church's innumerable claims to the gratitude of the people.

"The individual animated by a lively sense of his own dignity, abounding in activity, perseverance, energy, and enjoying the simultaneous development of all his faculties; woman elevated to the rank of the consort of man, and, as it were, recompensed for the duty of obedience by the respectful affection lavished upon her; the gentleness and constancy of family ties, protected by the powerful guarantees of good order and justice; an admirable public conscience, rich in maxims of sublime morality, in laws of justice and equity, in sentiments of honor and dignity; a conscience which survives the shipwreck of private morality, and does not allow unblushing corruption to reach the height which it attained in antiquity; a general mildness of manners, which in war prevents great excesses, and in peace renders life more tranquil and pleasing; a profound respect for man and all that belongs to him, which makes private acts of violence very uncommon, and in all political constitutions serves as a salutary check on governments; an ardent desire of perfection in all departments; an irresistible tendency, sometimes ill-directed, but always active, to improve the condition of the many; a secret impulse to protect the weak, to succor the unfortunate—an impulse which sometimes pursues its course with generous ardor, and which, whenever it is unable to develop itself, remains in the heart of society, and produces there the uneasiness and disquietude of remorse; a cosmopolitan spirit of universality, of propagandism, an inexhaustible fund of resources to grow again without danger of perishing, and for self-preservation in the most important junctures; a generous impatience, which longs to anticipate the future, and produces an incessant movement and agita-

tion, sometimes dangerous, but which are generally the germs of great benefits, and the symptoms of a strong principle of life,—such are the great characteristics which distinguish European civilization; such are the features which place it in a rank immensely superior to that of all other civilizations, ancient or modern."

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

All honor to the Catholic Church our Mother, who, after drawing mankind from the deluge of corruption in which it was plunged, raised it a second time from the ruins accumulated by barbarism! All honor to the Church which has so admirably moulded the gross elements placed under her hand by the irruption of the Germans and the other barbarians; in fusing the new races with the old, she formed the modern nations whose civilization casts such a bright light in the world! All honor to the Church whose entire history relates and proclaims the beneficent influence she exercised from century to century to our own day! What she realized in the past by her doctrine, her laws, her institutions, and by the divine grace which she communicates to souls, the Church can and still desires to realize, for she has lost nothing of her fruitfulness and her immortal youth.

Yet, notwithstanding these great and inestimable services, the Church has never, perhaps, encountered greater enmity. In every part of the globe simultaneous and powerful attacks are made upon her. Freemasonry,[1] centralizing all the forces at the disposition of the enemies of Jesus Christ, seems to be exhausting all its efforts to falsify the prophecy which proclaims the immortality of His divine work.

[1] On Freemasonry see Leo XIII., Encycl., Apr. 20, 1884; Pachtler, The Secret Warfare of Freemasonry Against Church and State; Dupanloup, Study of Freemasonry; Parsons, Studies, IV., ch. 18; A. C. Q. 239, vi. 577; C. W. xxii. 145; M. li. 305, 474; I. E. R., July, Sept., Oct. '99; D. R. III. Ser. xii. 144; A. E. R., Dec. '99, Febr. 1900.

We have no reason, however, despite this redoubled manifestation of rage and hatred, to be anxious as to the fate of the Church. Let us bear in mind the words of the illustrious St. Augustine, uttered fourteen hundred years ago. "They behold the Church and they say: 'She is about to die, and even her name will soon disappear; in a short time there will be no more Christians; they have had their day.' And while they are saying this, I see them die every day, and the Church still remains, proclaiming the power of God to succeeding generations."

"The Papacy," says, in his turn, Macaulay, the celebrated publicist and Protestant historian, "the Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and useful vigor. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

Yes; the divine promises permit us to look to the future with confidence. The Church may be persecuted like her divine Head; but is she not the Church *militant* here below? Whole countries may lose the inestimable benefit of the faith; but what she loses on the one hand, Providence restores to her on the other. What is happening before our eyes at this very moment? While the persecutions excited by secret societies are raging everywhere against her, the Church of Rome beholds the bonds of her indestructible union growing ever stronger; the voice of the supreme

Pontiff was never heard with greater veneration and respect by pastors and the faithful. And abroad, so far from disappearing, the Gospel is extending its conquests in a manner truly consoling. The work of the foreign missions, interrupted by the trials of the last century, has received a new impetus. The *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* attest the marvels of contemporaneous apostolate in hitherto unexplored countries of Africa, in the most savage islands of Oceanica, in the centre of Islamism, in the bosom of Asiatic idolatry. To cite but one instance: At the first Plenary Council in Baltimore in 1852 there were six archbishops and twenty-six bishops; at the Plenary Council of Baltimore held in 1866 there were seven archbishops and thirty-seven bishops; at the time of the third Plenary Council in 1884 in the same city the Catholic Church of America numbered twelve archbishops and sixty-three bishops. And now, at the opening of the twentieth century, there are within the United States fourteen Catholic provinces and seventy-five dioceses. Such is the progress of the faith in one country during a period of only fifty years.

Moreover, the very sufferings of the Church are a greater reason for confidence in the future, for the Church is the living image of Jesus Christ: Our Saviour had needs pass through the agony of Gethsemani before attaining the glory of His Resurrection. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 26.)

The life of the Church in the future, therefore, will be, as in the past, a perpetual series of alternating struggles and triumphs, until the dawn of that day marked by Providence when, leaving the arena which has witnessed all her glorious combats, she will introduce the last elect into the heavenly Jerusalem.

On this joyful and glorious day shall we be numbered among the children of the Church triumphant? Shall we have part in the boundless and never-ending happiness which God has prepared from the beginning for His beloved

children? Yes; it will be ours if, during our short pilgrimage in this world, we have been faithful in faith and works to the Church our Mother; if, with her, we have courageously labored, struggled, and suffered for the cause of God; if at our last hour we can truly say, in the words of St. Paul: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me in that day." (2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.)

"The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke i. 32, 33.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

Abraham in Egypt, 131.
Abuses in Church, 457; of Inquisition, 480; no proof against right, 507.
Accusations against the Church, 432, 457 ff.
Adam, prerogatives, 28, 248; body created, 101; his sin, 246, 248 f.
Age of universe, 75; organisms, 97; man, 99, 117 ff.
Agnosticism, 25.
Albigenses, 474.
Alluvia and deltas, 123 f.
America peopled, 116; Church in A., 573.
Analogies between Christianity and false religions, 260 f.
Anarchists, 429.
Anatomy of man and ape, 104 f.
Anglican schism, 344; orders, 353; persecutions, 463.
Animals and man, 102 ff.
Annibale, Card., on spiritism, 180.
Antipopes, 334.
Antiquity of human race, 117 ff.; Egypt, 125; India, 128; China, 128 f.; Chaldea, 129.
Ape and man, 102 f.
Apocryphal gospels, 156.
Apology, method of Christian, 161 f.; Catholic, 8, 56, 300, 341.
Apostasy a crime, 476.
Apostles, their miracles, 208; authority, 318; privileges, 331; successors, 327 ff.; A. and civil power, 413.
Apostolicity of the Church, 327, 339; A. not in Protestantism, 352; nor in Greek schism, 370.
Apollonius of Thyania, 179.
Arbitration, papal, 513.
Ark of Noe, 84 f.
Art and the Church, 557.
Articles, fundamental and non-fundamental, 315.
Assyrian discoveries and the Bible, 58, 130 ff., 134 ff.
Astronomy and the Bible, 86 ff.
Atheism, 25; State A., 428.
Augustine, St., on faith, 40; Mosaic days, 80; miracles, 169; his dilemma, 222.
Authority of God, 42; Bible, 52; the Church, 393 ff., 412; the apostles, 318; the Pope, 373 ff.; the State, 413, 421; A. of Pentateuch, 56 ff.; gospels, 141 ff.; evidence by A., 47
Authenticity, 56.
Auto da fe, 485.
Avignon, Popes at, 342.
Axioms, evidence of, 48.

Baalbak, ruins, 85.
Babel, tower of, 137.
Babylon, 136.
Baer, Dr. von, on unity of mankind, 112.
Balmes on civilizing influence of Church, 570.
Baltimore councils, 573; on slavery, 538.
Baptism of desire, 468, 471; blood, 471; water, 472.
Barbarians converted, 543 ff.
Bartholomew, massacre of St., 496 ff.; Church not responsible, 497.
Beast and man, 102 ff.
Bergier on miracles, 170; Christian education, 560.
Berthelot on science, 68.
Bible, books, 52; canon, 355, 358; historic authority, 52, 55, 301; inspiration, 54; interpretation,

65, 70, 346; chronology, 86, 98, 118 f.; phraseology, 70, 79, 87; variant readings, 60, 119, 147, 153; genealogies, 119; manuscripts, 60, 146; B., Church, and the rule of faith, 355 ff.; B. and modern science, 63 ff., 70 f.; geology, 72 ff., 120; astronomy, 88 ff.; biology, 93 ff.; paleontology, 97, 120.
Biology, 93 ff.
Bishops successors of apostles, 307, 317, 320, 327; difference, 331. See Episcopate.
Bollandists, 211, 337.
Books, Catholic, 6; bad, 6, 396.
Bossuet's "Variations of Protestantism," 346.
Boulanger on the deluge, 82.
Bourdaloue on faith, 40.
Broglie, de, on the gospels, 151; Buddhism, 276.
Brownson, O., on Roman primacy, 387, n.; bad popes, 519 n.
Bruno, Giordano, 496 n.
Buddha, 268.
Buddhism and Christianity, 265 ff.; its history, 268; dogma, 271; morality, 274; practical B., 276 ff.

Cæsarism, pagan, 533; in liberalism, 430.
Calvin, 344, 348 f.; intolerant, 461.
Camisards, war, 506.
Canonical mission, 329.
Canonization, 336 f.
Catechism, the, 561.
"Catholic," name, 338.
Catholic and Protestant nations, 546 ff.
Catholicism, liberal, 430 ff.
Catholics and modern governments, 423, 424 n.; civil liberty, 424 n., 455 f.; modern liberties, 448
Catholicity, 324, 326; of the Church, 324, 338; not in Protestantism, 324; nor in Greek schism, 369.
Cauchy on great men in Christianity, 297.
Causette on man and ape, 109.
Centralization, political, 456.
Certainty, 46; evidence, 46; kinds, 48, 176; C. of faith, 31, 33, 46, 50, 246 n.; and infallibility, 400; C. of miracles, 176 f.
Chalcedon, Council, on primacy, 388.
Chaldea, 129; discoveries, 130, 134 ff.
Charity, Christian, 216, 536 ff.; Buddhist, 275; perfect, 472.
Charlemagne, 336, 563.
Children, unbaptized, 470; pagan, 532; Christian, 542.
China, 128.
Christianity, its divinity, 160 ff., 293 f.; establishment and propagation, 217; conservation, 226; fruits and results, 236 ff., 521 ff.; doctrine, 243 ff., 535 ff.; superiority, 265, 296 ff.; necessity, obligation, 294; Ch. and false religions, 259 ff.; Buddhism, 265 ff.; Ch. and the Church, 305; and genius, 296, 553.
Chronology, biblical, 86, 98; uncertain, 118 f.
Chronometers, geological, 121.
Church, the Catholic, 299 ff.; prophecies, 203; definition, 301; a society, 303; visible, 306; its origin, 303 ff.; necessity, obligation, 305, 466 ff.; mission, end, 306, 412, 418, 421, 550; constitution, 307; perfect society, 308, 416 f.; true Church, 310 ff.; notes, 311 ff.; other attributes, 313; members, good and bad, 323, 468, 517; defections, 392; legislation, 335 n.; unity, 313, 331; sanctity, 321, 335; catholicity, 324, 338; apostolicity, 327, 339; other prerogatives, 391 ff.; perpetuity, 391, 572; indefectibility, 391 ff.; authority, 393; infallibility, 399; independence, 411 ff.; coercive power, 398, 417, 476; body and soul, 469; her rights, 416, 477; temporal property, 417; Ch. and Bible, 355 ff.; Ch. and State, 396, 398, 410 ff., 446; distinct, 415, 422; Church superior, 412, 417; conflict, 417 ff.; union, 420 ff., 441; Ch. and liberalism, 424 ff.; spirit of times, 433 f.; modern liberties, 443 ff.; civil liberty, 424 n., 455; Ch. and civilization, 521, 543; science, 41, 493, 550; letters and education, 550; culture, 550 ff.; genius, 296, 553; art, 557; persecutions, 215, 221, 227, 460 f.; tolerance, 441, 444, 458 ff.; abuses, 457; she promotes temporal happiness, 422,

549 ff.; Ch. and slavery, 536; charges against Ch., 432, 457 ff.
Churches, heretical and schismatical, 300. See Sects.
Circumstances alter cases, 443.
Civilization, true, 521, 524; pagan, 236, 242, 523 ff.; Christian, 535; Catholic and Protestant, 546.
Civiltà Cattolica on toleration, 444.
Claudius on loss of cosmic energy, 96.
Coercive power, 398, 417, 476; of State, 440.
Colleges and the Church, 569.
Color of human races, 114.
Communication of attributes in Christ, 292.
Concordats, 416, 418.
Confession. See Penance.
Conflict between faith and reason, 38, 42, 63; science and Bible, 63, 69; Church and State, 417.
Congregations. See Roman C.
Conscience, liberty of, 436, 500
Consciousness, 46.
Constance council, 334, 408 n.
Constantinople patriarchate, 361.
Contrition, perfect, 470, 472 n.
Conversion of St. Paul, 109; of heathens, 338; barbarians, 543.
Copernicus, 89, 488, 493.
Cosmogony, 73.
Councils, ecumenical, 403, 404; and Greek Church, 367; and primacy, 387; C. and education, 562.
Counsels, evangelical, 252.
Cranium, human, 115.
Creation of universe, 72, 93; light, 91; life, 92; man, 101.
Credibility, 41, 48.
Criterion of certainty, 46 ff.
Crusades, 503.
Culture and the Church, 550.

Darras on the Bible and Oriental discoveries, 139 f.
Darwinism, 103 ff.
Dates, biblical, 118 f.; 155. See Chronology.
Days of creation, 79, 91.
Decalogue, 27, 29, 549.
Dechamps, Card., on exclusive salvation, 467 f.
Declaration of Gallican clergy, 407.
Definition *ex Cathedra*, 409, 489.
Deltas and alluvia, 123.
Deluge, Mosaic, 80.
Denmark, persecutions, 462.
Deposition of kings by Pope, 508 ff.
Descendants of Adam, 110; Noe, 86.
Determinism, 451 f.
Development of faith, 332.
Devil, miracles, 178.
Discipline of Church changeable, 333, 392; by proper authority, 434.
Discoveries, Oriental and Bible, 58, 130.
Divinity of Christ, 285 ff.; Church, 299 ff.
Doctors of the Church, 341 n.
Dogma, immutable, 332, 339; no new dogmas, 339.
Dogmatic facts, 403.
Dominick, St., not Inquisitor, 475.

Earth, origin, 90; rotation, 89, 488 ff.; why man's dwelling, 87; how peopled, 116.
Ebers on Egypt and Bible, 134.
Edict of Nantes revoked, 499.
Education, rights of Church, 396; liberty of E., 436; neutral or nonsectarian, 396, 427; State monopoly, 430; need of religious E., 557; Church and E., 550; popular, 558; parish schools, 562; higher E., 567.
Egyptian discoveries, 58, 130; history, 125.
Emperors and Popes in Middle Ages, 509, 512.
End (purpose) of man, 28, 522; universe, 251; Church, 306, 418, 550; State, 421, 429.
England. See Anglican.
Ephesus, council, on primacy, 388.
Episcopate, institution, 304, 318 ff.; its powers, 329, 393; apostolic succession, 327, 330. See Bishops.
Errors of paganism, 32; in Bible, 154 n.; E. has no right, 479.
Esther, book of, and Persia, 138.
Euler on prayer, 168 n.; unbelief, 296.
Evangelical counsels, 252.
Evidence, 46, 48; of faith, 46.
Evil, origin, 249.
Evolution, 95 ff.
Ex Cathedra, 409, 489.
Exequatur, 416.
Experience, evidence of, 46.

Faith, certainty, 31, 33, 46, 400;

and reason, 38 ff.; supernatural grace, 42, 49, 51; and prayer, 42, 247 n.; motives and preambles, 41, 247 n.; evidence, 46; sources, 49; free act, 49 f., 246; difficulties, 45, 50 f.; "Good faith" and invincible ignorance, 467, 471; apostasy punishable, 476; right of preservation, 477.
Family, pagan, 531; Christian, 541.
Fatalism, 166 n., 451 f.
Fathers of the Church, 341 n.; apostolic, 143 n.; F. on gospels, 143; unity of Church, 315; ministry, 320; St. Peter, 380.
Faye on stars not inhabited, 89 n.
Fiefs, papal, 508 f.
Filioque, 363.
Flavius, Joseph, on Pentateuch, 60.
Flints, 120, 122 f.
Florence, council, 363, 368; on primacy, 389.
Fossils, 97 ff.; human, 121 ff.
Frayssinous' "Defense of Christianity," 8.
Freemasonry and liberalism, 430; great enemy of Church, 571.
Free-will, 450; existence, 451; F. and faith, 50, 245 f.; denied by Luther, 349.
Freppel, bishop, on science, 67; unbelief, 296.
Fundamentals and non-fundamentals, 315.

Galileo, trial, 488 ff.; and infallibility, 489; G. not martyred, 493; nor tortured, 495; *E pur si muove*, 496.
Gallicanism, 407.
Gaume on pagan society, 238.
Genealogies, biblical, 119.
Generation, spontaneous, 93 ff.; reproductive, 112.
Geology and Bible, 72.
Germs, organic, 94 n.
Gibbon refuted, 223 ff.
Gladiators, 528, 539.
God's relations with man, 25, 451 n., 453 f.; knowable, 30, 47; authority, 42; truthfulness, 49; providence, 165 n.; wisdom, 168, 294; love and mercy, 245 f.; glory, 251; rest, 77 n
Gospels, 53; authenticity, 141; integrity, 146; veracity, 148; apocryphal, 156; myths, 156 f.
Government of Church, 307, 394, 397 ff.; civil G., 421, 429; divine and human G., 440. See Ministry, State.
Grace, primitive, 28, 248; sanctifying, 250; means, 254; Gr of faith, 42, 49, 51.
Greek schism, 360; no unity, 366; no sanctity, 368; not Catholic, 369; nor apostolic, 370; return, 371; Gr. and Russian, 369.
Grounds of faith. See Motives.
Guizot on papacy in Middle Ages, 512 n.; on Church and education, 552.

Hair of human races, 115.
Happiness, natural and supernatural, 28, 420; temporal H. promoted by Church, 422, 549.
Harlez, de, on Buddhism, 277.
Henry VIII. of England, 344, 348.
Heresy, 310, 314, 395; a crime, 476, 478.
Hergenroether, Card., on Middle Ages, 509.
Hexahemeron, 76 ff., 98.
Hierarchy, Catholic, 307.
Hieroglyphics, 135.
Hir, le, on biblical chronology, 118; ancient nations, 126; Bible and tradition, 340 n.
History of religion, 259.
Holland, persecutions, 464.
Holy Office, 431, 474.
Hugo, Victor, on religious education, 559.
Huguenots intolerant, 462; seditious, 501; St. Bartholomew, 496; edict of Nantes, 499.
Huxley on man and ape, 103.
Hypnotism, 180 f.

Ignorance, invincible, 467, 469, 471.
Immaculate Conception, B. V. M., 408.
Immorality and unbelief, 296.
Immutability of God, 167; nature, 165; Church, 228, 392; dogma, 382 n., 482 f.
Incarnation, why on this earth, 87.
Indefectibility of Church, 391.
Independence of Church, 411; of State, 415; of Pope, 514; society dependent from God, 426; also man, 451, 453, 479.
India, history, 128.
Infallibility of apostles, 331; of Church, 391, 399; necessity, 400

given by Christ, 401; object, 403; seat, 404; Papal I., 404; its conditions, 409; not impeccability, 404; nor inspiration, 403; Gallicanism, 407; Galileo, 489; Roman congregations not infallible, 492.
Infidelity. See Unbelief.
Inhabited stars, 89.
Inquisition, 473 ff.; ecclesiastical, 474; lawful, 476; abuses, 480; clemency, 481, 484; effects, 486; Spanish I., 475; security, 482; abuses, 484; number of victims, 485; Protestant I., 485.
Inspiration of Bible, 54.
Instinct, 107, 451.
Institution, canonical, 329.
Integrity of biblical books, 56; Pentateuch, 60; gospels, 146.
Interpretation, biblical, 345; private, 346; of dogma, 431.
Intolerance, Catholic, 458, 465; Protestant, 460; infidel, 464 f. See Tolerance.
Ireland, Archbp., on papal independence, 517 n.
Islamism, spread, 225.

Jacolliot refuted, 256 n.
Jerusalem, destruction, 213; rebuilding, 214.
Jesus Christ, divine mission, 160; its proofs, 183; His miracles, 174, 183; their purpose, 186; His Resurrection, 187; prophecies fulfilled in Him, 206; His own prophecies, 212, 223; His doctrine, 243, 264; His manner of teaching, 257; holiness, 278; character, 287; no impostor, 283; His divinity, 285; proofs, 286 n.; God-man, 291; Mary, His mother, 292; His social royalty, 421; imitation and love of Ch., 282.
Jews, dispersion, 215; in Spain, 475.
Joan, Popess, 518.
Jonas and the fish, 66 n.
Joseph in Egypt, 131.
Josue and the sun, 65.
Jouffroy on catechism, 561.
Judgment, private, 346.
Julian, apostate, 214.
Jurisdiction and order, 329, 394, 398.
Justification, Protestant, 346 f.

Kennicot, Hebrew variants, 60
Keppler on Pentateuch, 66.

Laboring classes, pagan, 531; Christian, 540.
Lacordaire, "Conferences," 8; on Messianic prophecies, 206; Christ's goodness, 279 f.
Lake dwellings, 125.
Languages, 106; confusion of, 117.
Laplace's cosmogony, 73.
Lapparent on age of man, 121.
Laws of nature, 166 ff.; of history, 217 n.; moral L., 217.
Lazarus resuscitated, 184.
Legislation of the Church, 335 n.; her power, 398.
Leibnitz on salvation, 472 n.; on papal arbitration, 513.
Lenormant on Egyptian history, 126.
Leo XIII. on infidel and Catholic literature, 6; faith and reason, 41; science, 67; return of Greek schismatics, 372; Church and State, 410 ff.; concordats, 418; papal sovereignty, 414, 514; duties of civil power, 422 f., 428 f.; tolerance, 442; liberalism, 425 ff., 428; liberal Catholicism, 431 n.; liberty, 449, 454 ff.; temporal benefits by the Church, 521; higher education, 556.
Liberalism, 424 ff.; radical, 425; effects, 426, 429; social (moderate), 426; effects, 430; political L., 424 n.; economic, 425 n.; Catholic, 430; L. and socialism, 429, 439; modern liberties, 435; freemasonry, 430.
Liberties, modern, 435 ff.; of conscience and worship, 436, 500; press, education, association, 436; false, 437; injurious, 438; when tolerated, 442 ff.
Liberty, 449 ff.; not license, 450; physical, 440, 450, 453; moral, 440, 452; political and civil, 455; and the Church, 424 n., 456; L. of faith, 49, 246.
Libraries, Assyrian, 135.
Life, origin, 95, 97 ff.; disappearance, 96.
Light, creation of, 91.
Literature, its effect for good and evil, 6; bad L., 6, 396; L. and the Church, 553.
Liturgy. See Worship.

Llorente, 482 n., 484.
Louis XIV. and Gallicanism, 407.
Love of God and faith, 245 n.; of Christ, 282 f.
Luther, 343, 348; on good works and sin, 350; intolerant, 460.
Lyell, on man's age, 121.

Magic and miracles, 178.
Magisterium, of the Church, 394; twofold, 395; infallible, 400.
Man, his end, 28, 246 f., 420 f., 522; origin, 99; and beast, 102, 451, 454; primeval m., 118 n.; his reason, 106; speech, 106; religious sense, 107; perfectibility, 107; supernatural gifts, 248; redemption, 247, 250; liberty, 449; dependence, 451 n., 453, 479.
Manetho, historian, 126.
Mankind, age, 99; unity, 110; dispersion, 116.
Manuscripts of Pentateuch, 60; gospels, 146.
Marks of the Church, 311 ff.
Martyrs, Christian, 229 ff.; their testimony, 231, 233; number, 229, 232; no fanatics, 235 f.; "M. of science," 493, 496.
Mary, Mother of God, 292; Immaculate Conception, 408.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 496 ff.
Materialism, 101 n.
Mediævalism, 432.
Menzel, on Protestant intolerance, 460.
Messias, the, 36; prophecies, 200; types, 203; expectation, 205.
Metempsychosis, Buddhist, 273.
Method, proper, of science, 38 f.; of Christian apology, 161 f.; of Catholic apology, 8, 56, 300, 341.
Michael Cerularius, 361.
Middle Ages, laws, 441; penalties, 482; public law, 478 f., 508, 511 f.; power of popes, 507; civilization, 554; schools, 562 ff.
Might not right, 453 ff.
Milton and St. Peter, 376 n.
Minimizing, 431, 433.
Ministry, eccl., its institution, 304, 307, 310 ff.; unity, 317, 333; perpetuity, 327 f., 330; powers, 329, 394, 397; Protestant M., 348, 353.
Miracles, 161, 163 ff.; possible, 165; and natural law, 170; knowable, 171; probative value, 181; M. of Christ, 174, 183 ff.; apostles, 208; Church, 323; saints, 211, 336; modern, 211, 337; moral, 217 f.; M. of the devil, 178; pagan, 179.
Mission, canonical, 329.
Mohammedanism, 225, 504 f.
Monarchy, Church a, 307.
Monks and civilization, 554 f.
Monogenists, 110.
Monopoly of education, 430.
Morality, Christian, 252 f.; Buddhist, 274; Protestant, 351; independent, lay, 425, 428; pagan, 237, 257, 521 ff.; in Catholic and Protestant countries, 546 ff.
Moses, 35; author of Pentateuch, 57, 61; Mosaic religion; 35 f.; abrogated, 36.
Motives of faith, 41, 46, 49, 246 n.
Moulart, Canon, on Middle Ages, 509.
Mueller, Max, on diversity of languages, 117.
Mysteries of faith, 42 ff.; of nature, 43, 45.
Myths, biblical, 156 f.; 302.

Nantes, edict of, 499.
Napoleon I. on papal sovereignty 516.
Nature, its mysteries, 43, 45; laws, 166 n., 167; their harmony, 174.
Netherlands, persecutions, 464.
Newman, Card., on notes of Church, 312 n.
Nicæa, Council, on primacy, 387
Nihilists, 429.
Ninive. See Assyria.
Nirvana, Buddhist, 273.
Noe's Ark, 84 f.
Notes of the Church, 311 ff.
Number of martyrs, 232; victims of Inquisition, 485; Huguenots killed, 498.

Objections against Pentateuch, 86; gospels, 152; miracles, 173; Resurrection of Christ, 197; testimony of martyrs, 233; spread of Christianity, 223; divinity of Christ, 259; His teaching, 259; unity of the Church, 334; her power, 398; primacy of St. Peter, 377; papal principality, 515.
Oldenberg on Buddhism, 275.
Ollivier, Père, on Mosaic days, 80;

why this planet was chosen for Christ, 87; on primacy, 390.
Order and jurisdiction, 329 f.
Orders, Anglican, 353.
Ordination, 329.
Origin of universe, 72; earth and stars, 90; light, 91; vegetation, 92; life, 95; man, 99.
Original sin, 249, 470 n.
"Orthodox" church, 365.
"Outside the Church no salvation," 466.

Pagan philosophy, 32; religion, 256; society, 237 f., 523 ff.; P. nations converted, 218 ff., 526.
Paleontology, 97.
Papacy in Middle Ages, 508 ff.; salutary influence, 512; temporal power, 514; P. and civilization, 555. See Pope.
Papal States, 514.
Pasteur on spontaneous generation, 94.
"Patriarch universal," 361.
Patriarchal religion, 34; gradually corrupted, 35.
Patriarchates, eastern, 362 n., 366.
Paul, St., conversion, 209.
Peat-moors, 124.
Penance, sacrament, 254, 470.
Pentateuch, 52; authority, 56; style, 59; integrity, 60; veracity, 61; P. and modern sciences, 63; P. not a scientific book, 65 f.
Pentecost, miracle, 209.
Perfectibility of man, 107.
Perfection, Christian, 252.
Perpetuity of Church, 228.
Persecutions foretold, 215; pagan, 211 f., 233; Protestant, 460; Huguenot, 498.
Peter, St., primacy, 304, 307, 373 ff.; at Rome, 383; his successors, 327, 381.
Peter I. of Russia, 365.
Pfaff on Hexahemeron, 79; deluge, 84.
Photius, 361.
Pithom, city, 133.
Pie, Card., on miracle, 162; crusades, 505.
Pius IX., Syllabus, 419; on Church and State, 419, 447.
Placet, royal, 416.
Planetary system, origin, 89.
Plurality of inhabited worlds, 90.
Politics without religion, 427.
Polygamy, pagan, 532.
Polygenists, 110.
Polytheism, 256; origin, 260 f.
"Poor Scholars," 563.
Poor, the, before Christ, 530; after Ch., 539.
Pope, primacy, 373 ff.; not only of honor, but of jurisdiction or authority, 373, 382; successor of St. Peter, 381, 387; infallibility, 404; temporal power in Middle Ages, 508; its nature, 510; international arbitrator, 513; temporal sovereignty, 514; Popes and Inquisition, 474; science, 443; civilization, 555; antipopes, 334; P. during schisms, 342; P. and bishops, 307, 382.
Popess Joan, 518.
Positivism, 25.
Poverty, pagan, 530; Christian, 539.
Powers of Church, 329, 416; pope, 373, 382; State, 415.
Prayer and faith, 42, 247 n.; and laws of nature, 165 f., 168; means of grace, 254; the Lord's P., 246 n., 277.
Primacy, Roman, 373 ff. See Papacy, Pope. P. of honor, 373.
Private judgment, 346.
Propagation of Christianity, 217, 338, 573; Islamism and Protestantism, 225; Buddhism, 276.
Property, temporal, of Church, 417.
Prophecy, 161 f., 182 ff.; Messianic 56 n., 200 ff.; concerning Church, 208; by Christ, 212, 223.
Prophets, books of, 153.
Prosperity, temporal, in paganism, 523; in Catholic and Protestant countries, 546.
Protestantism, spread, 225; founders, 343; no ministry, 317; no unity, 345; no sanctity, 348; not catholic, 324, 352; nor apostolic, 352; false Church, 343; its fruits, 351; intolerant, 460; formulas, 347, 466 n.; Pr. and the Greeks, 365 n., 366 n.; an exclusive salvation, 466 n.
Providence, divine, 165.
Purcell, Archbp., on bad popes, 518 n., 519 n.
Purgatory and the Greeks, 370 n.

Quatrefages on man, 108.

Races, human, 111; resemblances, 113; differences, 114.
Radical liberals, 425; consistent, 429.
Rationalism, 38; effects, 51, 425; Social R., 427.
Rationalists on Pentateuch, 59 n., miracles, 161; Providence, 165; Church, 302.
Readings, variant, in Bible, 147, 153.
Reason, 47; and religion, 31; faith, 38; mysteries, 42; in man, 106.
Reformers, Protestant, 343, 348; had no divine mission, 353; intolerant, 460 ff.
Religion, natural, 25; supernatural, 26; positive, 27; revealed, 29; historic phases, 34; patriarchal, 34; Mosaic, 35; Christian, 36; its defence, 6, 8; study of Cath. R., 7; its divinity, 37, 39; mysteries, 42; analogy between true and false R., 259 ff.; R. and education, 396, 427; politics, 427; State, 420, 425, 439.
Religious sense, 107, 260.
Renan refuted, 158; on deluge, 83; Peter at Rome, 386.
Reproduction of species, 112.
Resurrection of Lazarus, 184; of Christ, 187 f.
Revelation, divine, 29; possibility, 30, 44; necessity, 30; history, 34; proofs, 46, 161; sources, 52; and science, 30, 39, 43, 67.
Right, 436 f.; not the same as might, 440, 452 ff.; error and evil have no rights, 437, 447, 479.
Rites, Oriental, 360; Congregation of R. and miracles, 336.
Roman Congregations not infallible, 492.
Rome, see of Peter, 383 ff.
Rossi, J. B., Hebrew variants, 60.
Rousseau on miracles, 165; Christ, 279, 281; Protestant tolerance, 459; education, 559 n.; intolerant, 464.
Rule of faith, 355 ff.
Russia Christianized, 364; schism, 364 f.; holy synod, 365; relation to Greek schism, 369; return to Rome, 371.
Ruskin (and Milton) on St. Peter, 376 n.

Sabbath, 29, 34, 65, 77 n.
Sacraments, 254, 335, 397.
Saint-Hilaire on Buddhism, 267 f.
Saints in the Church, 336 f.
Salvation exclusively in the Church, 305, 466 ff.; invincible ignorance, 467, 469; negative unbelief, 470 n.; S. of Jews, pagans, 471 f.; of Gentiles before Christ, 471.
Samaritans, 57.
Sanctity of Christ, 278 ff.; Church, 313, 321 ff., 457; not in Protestantism, 348; nor schism, 368.
Sardica, Council, on primacy, 388.
Sargon, fasts of, 137.
Schism, 310, 314; Western, 334; ancient, 342; Anglican, 344; Greek, 360; Russian, 364.
Science and revelation, 30, 39, 43; its proper method, 38; contradictions, 71; Sc. and Pentateuch, 63; Christianity, 67 ff.; miracles, 166; modern Sc., 64 n.
Scientists on spontaneous generation, 93; Mosaic creation, 69; deluge, 82; Noe's ark, 85; unity of mankind, 111; age of man, 121.
Schools. See Education.
Scriptures. See Bible.
Sects, ancient, 300, 360; Protestant, 324, 343, 345, 352.
Serfs in Middle Ages, 537 n.
Separation of Church and State, 427, 430, 446.
Sense, internal, 46; external, 47; moral and religious, 107 ff., 260.
Septuagint version, 56, 61.
Sin, origin, 249 f.; in Protestant doctrine, 349 f.
Sinners in the Church, 323, 517.
Slavery, pagan, 526; mitigated and abolished, 536; Jewish, 537 n.
Slave-trade, 538.
Society, definition, 302; perfect, 308; S. and religion, 426, 428, 439; S. pagan, 533; Christian, 542. See State.
Sovereignty, temporal, of Pope, 514.
Species and races, 111, 114.
Speech, 106.
Spiritualism, 180.
Stars inhabited, 90; origin, 90 f.
State, its purpose, 421 ff., 429; independence, 415; inferiority, 417 f.; S. and Church, 396, 410, 446; duties toward Church, 420

ff.; union with Church, 419; separation from Church, 427, 430, 446.
Straus refuted, 156 f.
Succession, apostolic, 327, 330; mode, 330. See Apostolicity.
Sufferings, 249, 251.
Sweden, intolerance, 463.
Syllabus of Pius IX., 419.

Templars, Knights, 481.
Testimony, evidence of, 44, 47, 49; divine, 43; pagan T. for Pentateuch, 58.
Theocracy, 414.
Thesis and hypothesis, 443.
Thiers on papal sovereignty, 576.
Thierry, A., on monks of Middle Ages, 555.
Tolerance, 442 ff.; allowed, 443; conditions, 447; civil and dogmatic, 446, 448, 458. See Intolerance.
Torture in Inquisition, 483; Galileo trial, 494.
Tradition, 340; primitive, 35, 260; Christian, 52; Jewish, 57, 63; apostolic and divine, 340; T. on deluge, 82; gospels, 142; Peter's Roman sojourn, 384; papal infallibility, 402.
Transformism, 99 ff.
Trinity, Bl., 45.
Truthfulness of Bible, 56; Pentateuch, 61; gospels, 148.

Ultramontanism, 432.
Unbaptized children, 470.
Unbelief, causes, 295 f.; negative and positive, 470 n.
Union of Church and State, 419 ff., 441.
Unity of human race, 110; of the Church, 313, 331 ff., 401; no U. in Protestantism, 345; nor in schism, 366.
Universality. See Catholicity.
Universe, origin, 72; formation, 73; age, 75; destruction, 96 n.; destiny, 251.
Universities and the Church, 567 ff.

Valsecchi, "Foundations of Religion," 8.
Variants, biblical, 147, 153.
Variations in gospels, 153; in Protestant belief, 346.
Varieties in the species, 111 f.
Vassals, papal, and fiefs, 508 f.
Vatican Council on necessity of revelation, 33; faith and reason, 38; miracles and prophecy, 163; primacy, 389; papal infallibility, 405; dogma, 433; science, 552.
Veracity. See Truthfulness.
Vegetation, origin, 92.
Vigouroux on deluge, 84; Egypt, 127; India and China, 129.
Vincent of Lerins, 357.
Virchow, Dr., on creation, 93, 95; man and monkey, 103; man's age, 123.

Waldensians, 474.
Wandering of nations, 543.
Wars, Peasants' W. in Germany, 460; Thirty Years' W., 461; religious, in France, 506; Huguenots, 501.
Wish to believe, 50, 246 n.
Will. See Freewill.
Wine in Egypt, 132.
Wiseman, Card., on gospels, 146.
Witchcraft, 486 n.
Woman, pagan, 531; Christian, 541.
Working classes, pagan, 531; Christian, 540.
Works, good, rejected by reformers, 349.
World. See Universe.
Worship, Christian, 255; Catholic, 335; changeable, 334; Protestant, 346; Oriental, 360; independent of civil rule, 417; liberty of W., 436, 443 n., 446, 500.

Zwinglius, 344, 348; intolerant, 462.

PRINTED BY BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

BOOKS OF DOCTRINE, INSTRUCTION, DEVOTION, MEDITATION, BIOGRAPHY, NOVELS, JUVENILES, ETC.

PUBLISHED BY

BENZIGER BROTHERS

NEW YORK
36-38 Barclay St.

CINCINNATI
429 Main St.

CHICAGO
205-207 W. Washington St.

Books not marked *net* will be sent postpaid on receipt of the advertised price. Where books are marked *net*, ten per cent. must be added for postage. Thus a book advertised at *net* $1.00 will be sent postpaid on receipt of $1.10.

I. INSTRUCTION, DOCTRINE, APOLOGETICS, CONTROVERSY, EDUCATIONAL.

ANECDOTES AND EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATING THE CATHOLIC CATHECHISM. Spirago. *net*, $3.00.

BOY GUIDANCE. Kilian, O.M. Cap. *net*, $2.00.

CATECHISM EXPLAINED, THE. Spirago-Clarke. *net*, $3.75.

CATECHISM OF THE VOWS FOR THE USE OF RELIGIOUS. Cotel, S.J. *net*, $0.75.

CATECHIST AND THE CATECHUMEN, THE. Weigand. *net*, $1.80.

CATHOLIC BELIEF. Faà di Bruno. Paper, $0.35; cloth, net, $1.00.

CATHOLIC CEREMONIES AND EXPLANATION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. Durand. Paper, $0.35; cloth, *net*, $1.00.

CATHOLIC CUSTOMS AND SYMBOLS. Henry, Litt.D. *net*, $2.00.

CATHOLIC NURSERY RHYMES. Sister Mary Gertrude. Retail, $0.25.

CATHOLIC'S READY ANSWER, THE. Hill, S.J. *net*, $2.00.

CATHOLIC TEACHER'S COMPANION, THE. Kirsch, O.M. Cap. Imitation leather, *net*, $3.00; real leather, $4.50.

CATHOLIC TEACHING FOR YOUNG AND OLD. Wray. Paper, $0.15.

CEREMONIAL FOR ALTAR BOYS. Britt, O.S.B. *net*, $1.00.

CHILD PREPARED FOR FIRST COMMUNION. Zulueta. Paper, *$0.25.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS. De-vivier-Messmer. *net*, $2.50.

CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. Bugg. *net*, $1.25.

DIVINE GRACE. Wirth. *net*, $0.40.

EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM. Kinkead. *net*, ¶$1.60.

EXPLANATION OF THE APOSTLES' CREED. Rolfus. *net*, $1.00.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMANDMENTS. Rolfus. *net*, $1.00.

EXPLANATION OF GOSPELS AND OF CATHOLIC WORSHIP. Lambert-Brennan. Paper, $0.35; cloth, *net*, $1.00.

EXPLANATION OF THE MASS. Cochem. *net*, $1.00.

EXPLANATION OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS. Rolfus. *net*, $1.00.

FINGER OF GOD, THE. Brown, M.A. *net*, $1.75.

FOLLOWING OF CHRIST, THE. Plain edition. With reflections. $0.55.

FUTURE LIFE, THE. Sasia, S.J. *net*, $3.00.

GENERAL CONFESSION MADE EASY. Konings, C.SS.R. Cloth, *$0.50.

GENTLEMAN, A. Egan. *net*, $1.00.

GIFT OF THE KING. By a Religious. *net*, $0.75.

GOFFINE'S DEVOUT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY-DAYS. *net*, $2.00.

HANDBOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Wilmers, S.J. *net*, ¶$2.50.

HINTS TO PREACHERS. Henry, Litt.D. *net*, $2.25.

HOME VIRTUES, THE. Doyle, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

HOME WORLD, THE. Doyle, S.J. Paper, $0.35; cloth, net, $1.50.

IDEALS OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI, THE. Felder, O.M. Cap.-Bittle, O.M.Cap. net, $4.00.

INTRODUCTION TO A DEVOUT LIFE. St. Francis de Sales. *net*, $1.75.

LADY, A. Bugg. *net*, $1.25.

LAWS OF THE KING. By a Religious. *net*, $0.75.
LETTERS ON MARRIAGE. SPALDING, S.J. *net*, $1.75.
LITTLE ALTAR BOY'S MANUAL. $0.75.
LITTLE FLOWER'S LOVE FOR HER PARENTS, THE. SISTER M. ELEANORE, C.S.C., Ph.D. *net*, $0.20.
LITTLE FLOWER'S LOVE FOR THE HOLY EUCHARIST, THE. SISTER M. ELEANOR, C.S.C., *net*, $0.20.
LIVING FOR GOD. SISTER MARIE PAULA. *net*, $1.75.
MANUAL OF THEOLOGY FOR THE LAITY. GEIERMANN, C.SS.R. Paper, *$0.75; cloth, *net*, $1.50.
MASS-SERVER'S CARD. Per doz., *net*, $0.80.
MASS FOR CHILDREN, THE. REV. WILLIAM R. KELLY. List $0.32.
MIND, THE. PYNE, S.J. *net*, $2.00.
OUR FIRST COMMUNION. REV. WILLIAM R. KELLY. List, $0.32.
OUR NUNS. LORD, S.J. Regular Edition, $2.50; De Luxe Edition, *net*, $3.50.
OUR SACRAMENTS. REV. WILLIAM R. KELLY. List $0.60.
OUT TO WIN. Straight Talks to Boys on the Way to Manhood. CONROY, S.J. *net*, $2.00.
POETS AND PILGRIMS. BRÉGY. School Ed., *net*, $1.50; Decorative Ed., *net*, $2.50.
PRINCIPLES OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE; or, AN EXPLANATION OF THE "CATECHISM OF THE VOWS." COTEL, S.J. *net*, $1.85.
QUEEN'S FESTIVALS, THE. By a Religious. *net*, $0.75.
RELIGION HOUR: BOOK ONE. HANNAN, D.D. List, $0.32; *net* to schools, $0,24.
SACRAMENTALS OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. LAMBING. Paper, $0.35; cloth, *net*, $1.00.
SHORT COURSE IN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. Paper, *$0.20.
SHORT STORIES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *net*, $1.00.
SIMPLE COURSE OF RELIGION. WEIGAND. *net*, price to schools per 100, $4.25.
SIX ONE-ACT PLAYS. LORD, S.J. *net*, $1.75.
SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN PARISHES. GARESCHÉ, S.J. *net*, $3.25.
SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND AGENCIES. SPALDING, S.J. *net*, $2.50.
SOCIALISM: ITS THEORETICAL BASIS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION. CATHREIN-GETTELMAN. *net*, $3.00.
SODALITY CONFERENCES. GARESCHÉ, S.J. *net*, $2.75. First Series.
SODALITY CONFERENCES. GARESCHE, S.J. *net*, $2.75. Second Series.
SPIRITISM: FACTS AND FRAUDS. BLACKMORE, S.J. *net*, $3.00.
SPIRITUAL PEPPER AND SALT STANG. Paper, *$0.40; cloth, *net*, $0.90.
STORIES OF THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. By a Religious. *net*, $1.00.
SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER'S GUIDE. SLOAN. net, $1.00.
TALKS TO BOYS. CONROY, S.J. Paper, $0.35.
TALKS TO NURSES. SPALDING, S.J. *net*, $2.00.
TALKS TO PARENTS. CONROY, S.J. *net*, $2.00.
TALKS WITH OUR DAUGHTERS. SISTER M. ELEANORE, Ph.D. Cloth. *net*, $1.50.
TALKS WITH TEACHERS. SISTER M. PAULA. *net*, $1.75.
TEACHER TELLS A STORY: BOOK ONE. HANNAN, D. D. List $2.00.
VOCATIONS EXPLAINED. Cut flush, *$0.25.
WAY OF INTERIOR PEACE. DE LEHEN, S.J. *net*, $2.25.
WONDERFUL SACRAMENTS, THE. DOYLE, S.J. *net*, paper, $0.35; cloth, *net*, $1.75.
WONDER DAYS, THE. TAGGART. *net*, $0.40.
WONDER GIFTS, THE. TAGGART. *net*, $0.40.
WONDER OFFERING, THE. TAGGART. *net*, $0.40.
WONDER STORY, THE. TAGGART. *net*, $0.40.

II. DEVOTION MEDITATION, SPIRITUAL READING. PRAYER-BOOKS

ABANDONMENT; or Absolute Surrender of Self to Divine Providence. CAUSSADE, S.J. *net*, $1.00.
BLESSED SACRAMENT BOOK. Prayer-Book by FATHER LASANCE. Im. leather, $2.75.
BOYS' AND GIRLS' PRAYER-BOOK. FINN, S.J. 27 colored illustrations, 22 in black and

white. Im. leather, round corners, limp, cut flush. Retail, $0.45. Other bindings up to $2.50.

CATHOLIC GIRL'S GUIDE, THE. Prayer-Book by FATHER LASANCE. Seal grain cloth, stiff covers, red edges, $1.75. Im. leather, limp, red edges, $2.00; gold edges, $2.50. Real leather, limp, gold edges, $3.00.

COMMUNION DEVOTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS. SISTERS OF NOTRE DAME. Imitation leather, *net*, $2.75; leather, $4.00.

CONVENT ECHOES. Devotional Verses. SISTER M. PARACLITA. *net*, $1.00.

EARLY FRIENDS OF CHRIST, THE. CONROY, S.J. *net*, $2.75.

EPITOME OF THE PRIESTLY LIFE, AN. ARVISENET-O'SULLIVAN. *net*, $2.50.

EUCHARISTIC PRIEST, THE. LEPICIER, O.S.M. *net*, $2.00

EVER TIMELY THOUGHTS. GARESCHÉ, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

FAIREST FLOWER OF PARADISE. LEPICIER, O.S.M. *net*, $1.75.

FOR FREQUENT COMMUNICANTS. ROCHE, S.J. Paper, *$0.20.

GO TO JOSEPH. LEPICIER, O.S.M. *net*, $1.75.

HER LITTLE WAY. CLARKE. *net*, $1.50.

HOLY HOUR, THE. KEILEY. 16mo. *$0.20.

HOLY HOUR OF ADORATION. STANG. *net*, $1.25.

HOLY SOULS BOOK. Reflections on Purgatory. A Complete Prayer-Book. By REV. F. X. LASANCE. Im. leather, round corners, red edges, $1.90; gold edges, $2.50; real leather, gold edges, $3.00.

IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART. ARNOUDT. *net*, $2.00.

JESUS CHRIST, THE KING OF OUR HEARTS. LEPICIER, O.S.M. *net*, $1.75.

KEEP THE GATE. WILLIAMS, S.J. *net*, paper, $0.35.

LET US PRAY. LASANCE. Retail, $0.35.

LIFE'S LESSONS. GARESCHÉ, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

LIFT UP YOUR HEARTS. By REV. F. X. LASANCE. Im. leather, round corners, red edges, retail, $2.75; gold edges, retail, $3.25; Amer. seal, limp, gold side, gold edges, retail, $3.75; Amer. morocco, seal grain, gold roll, red under gold edges, retail, $5.00.

LITTLE COMMUNICANTS' PRAYER-BOOK. SLOAN. $0.60.

LITTLE FLOWER AND THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, THE. HUSSLEIN, S.J. *net*, $0.60.

LITTLE FLOWER TREASURY, THE. Edited by CARYL COLEMAN. Im. leather, fine grain, very flexible, round corners, red edges. Retail, $0.65. Other bindings up to $1.75.

LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. ANTHONY. LASANCE, *net*, $0.50.

LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. JOSEPH. LINGS. *net*, $0.50.

LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. RITA. MCGRATH. $1.25.

LITTLE MASS BOOK, THE. LYNCH. Paper, *$0.15.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. Vest-pocket Edition. A little Book of Prayer for Men and Women. By REV. F. X. LASANCE. Oblong, 32mo. $1.00.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. A Book of Prayer for Men and Women. By REV. F. X. LASANCE. Extra Large Type Edition, 544 pages, 16mo. $1.90.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. Prayer-Book by REV. F. X. LASANCE. Thin Edition. Im. leather. $1.50.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. Prayer-Book by REV. F. X. LASANCE. Thin edition with Epistles and Gospels. $1.75.

MANUAL OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. LASANCE. Im. leather, limp, red edges, *net*, $2.25.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. VERCRUYSSE, S.J. 2 vols, *net*, $6.50.

MEDITATIONS FOR THE USE OF THE SECULAR CLERGY. CHAIGNON, S.J., 2 vols. *net*, $7.50.

MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE, THE TEACHING AND THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST. ILG-CLARKE. 2 vols. *net*, $5.75.

MEDITATIONS ON THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST. PERINALDO. *net*, $1.00.

MENDING THE NETS. MORNING STAR SERIES II. FEELY, S.J. *net*, $0.75.

MISSION REMEMBRANCE OF THE REDEMPTORIST FATHERS. GEIERMANN, C.SS.R. $2.00.

MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE. RUSSELL, S.J. *net*, $0.90.

MORNING SACRIFICE, THE. MOFFAT, S.J. Retail, $0.15.

MY GOD AND MY ALL. A Prayer-Book for Children. By REV. F. X. LASANCE. Black or white, cloth, square corners, white edges, retail, $0.35. Imit. leather, black or white, seal grain, gold edges, retail, $0.70. Persian Morocco.

gold side and edges, retail, $1.25. Same, white leather, retail, $1.50. Celluloid, retail, $1.00; with Indulgence Cross, retail, $1.35.

MY PRAYER-BOOK. Happiness in Goodness. Reflections, Counsels, Prayers, and Devotions. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. 16mo. Seal grain cloth, stiff covers, $1.65. Imitation leather, limp, round corners, red edges, $1.85; gold edges, $2.25. Real leather, gold edges, $2.75.

MY PRAYER-BOOK. Extra Large Type Edition. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. Seal grain cloth, stiff covers, square corners, red edges, $1.85. Imitation leather, round corners, red edges, $2.25. Imitation leather, round corners, gold edges, $3.25. American seal, limp, gold side, gold edges, $4.00.

MYSTERY OF LOVE, THE. Lepicier, O.S.M. *net*, $1.75.

NEW MISSAL FOR EVERY DAY, THE. Complete Missal in English for Every Day in the Year. New Edition. With Introduction Notes and a Book of Prayer. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. Oblong, 32mo. Imitation leather, $3.00.

NEW MISSAL FOR EVERY DAY, (Student's Edition.) By Rev. F. X. Lasance. Retail $2.00.

NEW TESTAMENT. 12mo edition. Large type. Cloth, *net*, $1.75.

NOVENA IN HONOR OF SAINT THERESE OF THE CHILD JESUS. Coleman, *net*, $0.15.

OFFICE OF HOLY WEEK, COMPLETE. Latin and English. Cut flush, *net*, $0.65; silk cloth, *net*, $1.00; Am. seal, red edges, *net*, $2.25.

OUR FAVORITE DEVOTIONS. Lings, *net*, $1.50.

OUR FAVORITE NOVENAS. Lings. *net*, $1.50.

OUR LADY BOOK. By Rev. F. X. Lasance. Imitation leather, limp, round corners, red edges, $2.00. Morocco Grain. Imitation Leather, gold edges, $2.50. American Seal, limp, gold side, gold edges, $3.00. Rutland limp, red under gold edges, $3.75. Turkey Morocco, limp, gold roll, red under gold edges, $5.25.

PATHS OF GOODNESS, THE. Garesché, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S COMPANION. McGrath. $0.60.

PRAYER-BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS. Lasance. 16mo. Imitation leather, limp, red edges, *net*, $2.50.

PRAYERS FOR OUR DEAD. McGrath. Cloth, $0.35; imitation leather, $0.75.

PRISONER OF LOVE. Prayer-Book by Father Lasance. Im leather, limp, red edges, $2.00.

REFLECTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS. Lasance. *net*, $2.75.

REJOICE IN THE LORD. Prayer-Book by Father Lasance. $2.00.

ROSARY NOVENAS TO OUR LADY. Lacey. *net*, $0.15.

ROSE WREATH FOR THE CROWNING OF ST. TERESA OF THE CHILD JESUS, A. Clarke. *net*, $1.50.

SACRED HEART BOOK. Prayer-Book by Father Lasance. Im. leather, limp, red edges. $1.75.

SERAPHIC GUIDE, THE. $1.50.

SHORT MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY. Lasausse. *net*, $1.50.

SHORT VISITS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. Lasance. *net*, $0.50.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' COMPANION. McGrath. Vest-pocket shape, silk cloth or khaki, $0.35.

SOUVENIR OF THE NOVITIATE. Taylor. *net*, $1.25.

SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE, THE, AND THE LIFE OF SACRIFICE IN THE RELIGIOUS STATE. Giraud. *net*. $3.00.

SPIRITUAL CONSIDERATIONS. Buckler, O.P. *net*, $1.00.

SUNDAY MISSAL, THE. Lasance, Im. leather, limp, red edges. $2.25.

TEACHINGS OF THE LITTLE FLOWER, THE. Garesché, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

THINGS IMMORTAL, THE Garesché S.J. *net*, $1.50.

THOUGHTS FOR TODAY. MORNING-STAR SERIES I. Feeley, S.J. *net*, $0.75.

THOUGHTS ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. Lasance. Im. leather, limp, red edges, *net*, $2.75.

THY KINGDOM COME, SERIES I. Moffat S.J. *net*, $0.30.

THY KINGDOM COME, SERIES II. Moffat, S.J. *net*, $0.30.

THY KINGDOM COME, SERIES III. Moffat, S.J. *net*, $0.30.

THY KINGDOM COME, SERIES IV. Moffat, S.J. *net*, $0.30.

TRUE SPOUSE OF CHRIST. Liguori. *net*, $2.00.

VALUES EVERLASTING. THE. Garesché, S.J. *net*, $1.50.

VIGIL HOUR, THE. Ryan, S.J. Paper, *$0.25.

VISITS TO JESUS IN THE TABERNACLE. Lasance. Im. leather, limp, red edges. $2.25.

VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT. Liguori. *net* $1.00.

DATE DUE

JUL 21 1965

SEP 25 2019

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 3525 00023 7195

DISCARD

40958

DISCARD

BX
1751
D5

Devivier, W.
Christian apologetics.

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS